

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas condemning the growing control of the cattle market by the big packers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York in opposition to a Government hydroelectric plant for the production of nitrates and fertilizers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 15659, granting an increase of pension to James Livingstone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce of New York City, protesting against House bill 8665 relative to the Taylor system of shop management; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of members of Chicago (Ill.) Customs Club, favoring House bill 9054 for extended leave of absence of Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: Petition of Inez Funk and other members of the edelweiss class, Dublin, Ind., favoring the enactment of House bill 456, providing for the censorship of moving-picture films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Della Faust, Noblesville, Ind., and 25 other citizens of said State, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 645; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Mrs. R. P. Lindsay and other members of the Helen Hunt Club, Cambridge City, Ind., favoring the enactment of House bill 456, providing for the censorship of moving-picture films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of C. F. Bradburn, Richmond, Ind., and 23 other laboring men of said city, favoring the enactment of House bill 8665 to prohibit the stop-watch system of employment; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Arthur V. Weidlich and others, against exclusion of Red Cross supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, opposing a Government hydroelectric plant for production of nitrates and fertilizers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Second Convention of Mental Hygiene Societies of the United States, favoring bill to establish a division of mental hygiene in the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, objecting to the Tavenner bill, against the Taylor system; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of United Iron Workers of America, favoring House bill 137, relative to inspection of creameries and dairies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Southern Hardware Jobbers' Association, favoring bill for prevention of floods of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Leon C. Wheeler and Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Barryton and G. M. Bierly and Union Sunday School of Lake George, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of International Association of Machinists, favoring House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring national military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing any method of agricultural banking requiring use of Government funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Quartette Club, favoring peaceful relations with foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 498, United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters, opposing reduction of wages of employees in Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 15377, granting a pension to Christopher Dahlen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 15723, granting a pension to Sarah E. Simonton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Okke Kluins and 130 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of A. M. L. Herenins, Centerville, R. I., favoring embargo resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Elmer E. Okeson and 40 others and Francis T. Bedworth and 28 others, all of New Haven, Conn., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Robert Sutton and other citizens of Lucas County, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of House bill 652 or any similar compulsory Sunday-observance measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Robert Sutton and other citizens of Lucas County, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of House bill 6468 or any similar amendment to the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 18, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast so impressed Thyself upon all the laws of nature and upon all the processes of human thinking that no government has ever been founded that was not based upon its ultimate relation to Thee. Thou hast not separated Thyself from men. In the onward path of progress we need more and more Thy inspiration and guidance and blessing. We shall never be enabled to govern ourselves unless we are willing freely to submit ourselves to the divine government. We pray that to-day we may look up through the toil and care of the day's work in humble submission to the divine will and realize in personal experience that in the midst of the conflict of interest of this world there is a hand governing all, and that our safety and glory lie in submission to the guidance of the hand of God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, May 16, 1916, was read and approved.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Johnson, Me.	Norris	Smoot
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Gorman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones	Overman	Stone
Chilton	Kenyon	Page	Swanson
Clapp	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Poinsett	Tillman
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Vardaman
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shafroth	Walsh
Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Gallinger	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Gore	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TAGGART]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] on account of sickness in his family. I desire this announcement to stand for the day. On all record votes my colleague is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of useless papers and papers without historical value in the Department of Labor and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

LIST OF CASES (S. DOC. NO. 445).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting

a list of cases referred to the court by the United States Senate, which cases were dismissed by the court under section 5 of the act of March 4, 1915, commonly known as the Crawford amendment, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. MOSS of Indiana, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. PLATT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14777) to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Cal., and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 5221. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of E. C. Hornor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Order of Railroad Conductors, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution of Newark, N. J., praying for an increase in armament, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Thorndale, Tex., praying that Great Britain permit the shipment of condensed milk to Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Manila Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, National Military Home, Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Manila Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, National Military Home, Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to certain survivors of the Indian wars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society of Riverdale, Md., praying for national prohibition and also for the prohibition of the exportation of intoxicating liquor to Africa, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have received a great number of telegrams on the so-called blue-tag system of sending second-class matter by freight. I present four as a sample, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK, May 17, 1916.

As publishers of automobile dealers and repairers, we wish to protest earnestly against the attempt of the Postmaster General to revive the old blue-tag system of sending second-class matter by freight. When tried some years ago it caused great trouble by delayed mails. We ask that this provision be stricken out of the Post Office appropriation bill.

MOTOR VEHICLE PUB. CO.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK, May 17, 1916.

We desire, as publishers of the Blacksmith and Wheelwright, to protest vigorously against the restoration of the blue-tag system of sending second-class mail by freight, as recommended by the Postmaster General. Previously when this system was tested it resulted in tedious delays and great disappointment to our subscribers.

M. T. RICHARDSON CO.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

CHICAGO, May 17, 1916.

We vigorously urge the elimination of the blue-tag amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill, because the blue-tag system is an

unjust discrimination against the publication so handled, because it restricts and impairs their influence and their usefulness to their readers, and because in so doing it works to the disadvantage and even to the substantial injury of some of our leading industries.

THE OFFICE APPLIANCE CO.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., May 16, 1916.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,
Senate Post Office Committee:

When the Post Office Department is so organized that it is possible to determine the cost of handling second-class mail, we, as publishers, are willing to pay whatever may be the proper price for transporting second-class mail. We would much prefer to pay four, six, or even ten times the present pound rate and secure even greater efficiency in distribution rather than to suffer the reinstitution of the blue-tag system. Your efforts toward the elimination of that feature from the Post Office bill now pending will be appreciated.

PERIODICAL PUBLISHING CO.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Paradise, N. Dak., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Mott, N. Dak., and a petition of the Commercial Club of Hettinger, N. Dak., praying that the difficulties between railroads and their employees be settled by arbitration, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of Miss N. L. Miller, of Roland Park, Md., remonstrating against the action of Great Britain in prohibiting the Red Cross from sending supplies to Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Local Union of Christian Endeavor of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Orcutt Camp, No. 10, Sons of Veterans, of Kalamazoo, Mich., praying for an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., praying that the United States remain at peace, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Michigan State Christian Endeavor Union, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Michigan State Christian Endeavor Union, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sebewaing, Mich., remonstrating against the action of Great Britain in prohibiting the sending of Red Cross supplies to Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Presbyterian Church of Decatur, Mich., praying for prohibition in the island of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. WEEKS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against sectarian appropriations, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Somerville, Mass., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Socialist Party of Deerfield, Mass., praying for an investigation into the Mexican situation, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Bay State Automobile Association, of Massachusetts, praying for an investigation into the price of gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Hadley, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Nelson A. Miles Camp, No. 36, United Spanish War Veterans, of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Great Falls, Mont., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRADY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newport, Idaho, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TILMAN presented a petition of the members of the missionary societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Dillon, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of intoxicating liquor to Africa, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Long Beach, Cal., praying for an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Lincoln County (Wyo.) Branch of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Free-land, Wash., remonstrating against any change being made in the parcel-post law, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented the petition of Prof. A. C. Barker, of Oakland, Cal., praying for Federal aid for vocational education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Redlands, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Fort Romie Grange, No. 358, Patrons of Husbandry, of Soledad, Cal., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oakland, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HUGHES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Leonia, N. J., praying for prohibition in the Hawaiian Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boonton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of intoxicating liquor to Africa, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER W. J. HARRIS.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, out of order there is a matter that I should like to call to the attention of the Senators from Georgia. I will ask the Secretary to read from the Washington Post of May 17 the part marked in the last column.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

W. J. HARRIS A POWER, HE SAYS.

"William J. Harris, of the Federal Trade Commission, is the dominant power now in Georgia politics," said Crawford Wheatley, of Americus, Ga., one of the delegates at large from Georgia to the Democratic national convention, at the New Willard, yesterday.

"At the recent State convention in Macon," continued Mr. Wheatley, "the name of Mr. Harris, who was on the ground to look after the administration's interests, elicited almost as much applause as that of the President. He was the only person asked to address the convention, although both Senator THOMAS W. HARDWICK and Gov. NAT HARRIS were present. As a further mark of confidence the slate of delegates to the national convention which he approved was elected. Mr. Harris and the President were both endorsed by the convention."

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I caused this clipping from the newspaper to be read without consultation with the Senator from Georgia, for the reason that, if true, I wish to call public attention to the impropriety of a member of the Federal Trade Commission attending and attempting to influence a political convention, and also for the reason that if it is untrue I desire as much publicity for the denial as the newspaper article itself received.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to state, if the Senator will hear me through—

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to have the Senator yield to me as soon as he can.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will yield in a moment to the Senator. Mr. President, I will state that for seven or eight years I urged in this body the organization of a trade commission, believing that the Government could through some form of organization be a corrector of bad business practices and a friendly guide to business rather than a relentless prosecutor, believing that in

the main the business men of the country wish to work in harmony with its laws, and that a trade commission through its instructive and corrective powers would be beneficial to the business, the well-intentioned and honest business of the country.

That Trade Commission was finally authorized and organized as a nonpartisan commission, and the only way of making a nonpartisan commission under our form of Government is to make a bipartisan commission. So it was provided in the act which finally passed that the Trade Commission should consist of five members, of whom no more than three should belong to one political party.

Mr. President, I regard these great public utility commissions for public regulation as quasi judicial in character. The confidence of the country depends upon the maintenance of that quasi judicial character, and although the members of that commission are not to be denied their political convictions or their expression, manifestly every sense of propriety requires that they should not be active in political organizations and conventions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me to proceed with my statement before I yield for an interruption?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire under what authority—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa rises to a parliamentary inquiry which is his privilege. He will state it.

Mr. KENYON. Has there been any unanimous consent given for the Senator from Nevada to proceed? If not, I object, and ask for the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There ought to be unanimous consent given to make such a statement.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I move that I be allowed to proceed.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that I have practically unanimous consent, because I was given the floor and announced that out of order I proposed—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unanimous consent was never requested, and the question has not been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator from Nevada says he asked for unanimous consent and it was granted, I withdraw my demand for the regular order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not ask for unanimous consent; but I stated, my recollection is, that I wished to present this matter out of order.

Mr. TILMAN. The Senator has a right to do it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am not sure about the exact language I used.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is very interesting, and I hope the Senator will proceed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, it is hard for me to believe that Mr. Harris, whom I know and whom I respect, had this participation in the formation and development of a political organization or convention in the State of Georgia such as this newspaper refers to. I hope that the Senators from Georgia—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will yield in a moment. I hope that the Senators from Georgia will be able to deny this statement, and I would be glad if they do, but I think a great public service will be done even though the incorrectness of this newspaper statement be established by calling public attention and the attention of the members of these various commissions to the fact that their active participation in politics is not expected by the Congress of the United States which created them; that they are the servants of Congress in the regulation of commerce; that they are as much taken out of political activity as are the courts themselves; and that it is an impropriety for them to indulge in political activity. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, since the Senator from Nevada has had the newspaper article in question read from the desk and therefore brought it to the attention of the Senate, I think, in justice to Mr. Harris, I ought to say that, in my judgment—and I was present at the convention referred to—the statements in this article are in the main inaccurate and incorrect.

It is true that Mr. Harris was in attendance on the State Democratic convention of Georgia. He was there, according to my understanding—I think I am right about that—as a delegate from his own county, under appointment of the chairman of the county executive committee of that county. If Mr. Harris had anything whatever to do with the selection of the

delegation more than a hundred other leading Democrats from almost as many Georgia counties had, I am not advised of that fact. I know that to a large extent the article misstates the facts.

I think I can say for the information of the Senator from Nevada and of the Senate—and it may throw some light on this transaction—that this convention was a very harmonious affair. There was no conflict in it between Mr. Harris and the Senators from Georgia or anybody else. Every one of the delegates selected by the convention was elected unanimously, and the platform which they adopted was satisfactory to everybody and went through without a dissenting vote. I do not believe that Mr. Harris had anything whatever to do with the selection of delegates, except that he may have agreed with many other gentlemen that the gentlemen selected as delegates were satisfactory. He was not invited to address the convention. The chairman of the convention—and I do not think there was any impropriety in it—made some complimentary reference to the appointment of Mr. Harris by the President. It was well received by the delegates, and some man, I think, called on Mr. Harris for a speech. Mr. Harris, with a great deal of propriety, I thought, did not speak.

Nor was it true—and I will say this purely out of justice to the governor of Georgia and myself, for a Georgia Democratic convention is never discourteous to Democratic officials—that we were not invited to address the convention. Both the governor and myself, on account of the lateness of the hour when the work of the convention was done, sent word by a committee that came to see us that we preferred not to address the convention. We were more inclined to attend to business and to let the delegation get home than to deliver speeches. In that respect we may have differed from some other bodies of which I can think.

What I want to say to the Senator—possibly to reassure him to some extent—is that I think the participation of Mr. Harris in this convention or his political activities in it are very much exaggerated by some gentlemen who merely intended to pay him a graceful compliment. The criticism is based more upon that than upon anything, I think, that actually occurred.

Of course the Senator might question—although I do not know that he ought to do so—the propriety of a man holding an office of this character becoming a delegate or going as a delegate to a convention, or attending one. Personally I can not say that I can see any impropriety in it. We do not cease to be Democrats or Republicans because we hold office here. There is no need to have any pretense about that. You are not going to get many nonpartisan officers, either Democrats or Republicans. There was nothing in the conduct of Mr. Harris that was officious or which was offensive to the Senators from Georgia, or, so far as I know, to any Georgia Democrat. The convention was harmonious in every way and there was no fight in it, factional or otherwise, for anybody to participate in.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks there is any greater crime against propriety for a member of the Federal Trade Commission to be a delegate to a State convention than it is for a Justice of the Supreme Court to be a candidate for President of the United States?

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the Senator from Missouri will have to decide that question for himself, and so will everybody else. I do not want to commit myself, however, by my answer to the proposition that any such condition as that exists. I do not know whether or not it does.

Mr. KERN. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me to say a word—

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish only to say one word more, if the Senator will pardon me, and then I will yield to any other Senator. I think this has gone far enough. I think the whole thing has been exaggerated. I think it is merely an attempt of a friend, who probably lacked exactly good judgment in the matter, to pay a compliment to a friend; and I do not believe, from my personal knowledge of the conduct of Mr. Harris at the time, that Mr. Harris was guilty of any undue political activity or of any undue interference with its proceedings, unless the bare fact that he was a delegate to that convention or attended it may be considered as such. I certainly do not so appraise his conduct.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that I am very glad to hear that the activities of this member of the Federal Trade Commission were not so great as are indicated by this newspaper item. I quite differ with him, however, as to the propriety of a member of any of these regulating commissions, whose functions are quasi judicial, participating in political conventions and in political management; and so far

as I am concerned, whilst I am glad to know that the offense is minimized, I feel that it still exists, and I shall regard it as my duty to bring the matter before the Interstate Commerce Committee, with a view to investigating the extent to which this practice is indulged.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. KERN. I insist on the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am interested in what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has said about this commissioner. If this member offended, what does the Senator think of a member of that commission coming to the Senate and using his influence to control legislation?

Mr. KENYON. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are now in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GORE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 6047) to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," reported it without amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am directed by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments and I submit a report (No. 459) thereon. I desire to give notice that upon the conclusion of the river and harbor bill I shall ask the Senate to take up this bill for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of Julia R. Goodloe, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 451) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 782. A bill granting additional rights to settlers on reclamation projects (Rept. No. 456);

S. 5379. A bill validating certain homestead entries (Rept. No. 457); and

S. 5615. A bill granting certain lands to the Board of Park Commissioners of the State of Washington for park purposes (Rept. No. 458).

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 778. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Glacier National Park in the Rocky Mountains south of the international boundary line, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1910 (Rept. No. 452);

S. 790. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of May 1, 1888, and extend the provisions of section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to certain lands in the State of Montana embraced within the provisions of said act, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 453);

S. 5082. A bill adding certain lands to the Missoula National Forest, Mont. (Rept. No. 454); and

S. 5772. A bill to provide for the sinking of artesian wells, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 455).

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. From the Committee on Immigration I report back additional committee amendments to the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States, and ask that they be printed.

I also ask unanimous consent that a reprint of the bill be made incorporating these amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERDIDO BAY BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5841) to authorize the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Baldwin County, Ala., to Cummings Point, Escambia County, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 450) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANDARDIZATION OF LIME BARRELS.

Mr. CLAPP. From the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 5425) to standardize lime barrels, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I will explain the bill, if any Senator desires that I shall do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be first read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a large and a small barrel of lime, the large barrel to consist of 280 pounds and the small barrel to consist of 180 pounds, net weight.

Sec. 2. That when lime is sold in barrels the words "large barrel, 280 pounds" or "small barrel, 180 pounds" shall be stenciled or otherwise clearly and permanently marked upon one or both heads, and in addition the name of the manufacturer of the lime and the name of the brand, if any, under which it is sold: *Provided, however,* That when a jobber or local dealer in lime sells lime in quantities of more than one barrel and delivers it in barrels which are not headed and are used merely as containers, then nothing in this act shall be deemed to require that the barrels be marked as provided in this section or that each individual barrel contain either of the standard weights established in section 1, but he shall nevertheless deliver a total weight equivalent to the total weight of the number of large or small barrels represented, sold, or charged for by him or purported to be delivered by him pursuant to an order.

Sec. 3. That rules and regulations for the enforcement of this act not inconsistent with the provisions of the act shall be made by the Director of the Bureau of Standards and approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and that such rules and regulations shall include reasonable variations or tolerances which may be allowed.

Sec. 4. That it shall be unlawful to pack or to sell, offer, or expose for sale any other barrels of lime than those established in section 1; or to pack or to sell, offer, or expose for sale any barrels of lime which are not marked as provided in section 2; or to represent, sell, charge for, or purport to deliver as a large or small barrel of lime any less weight of lime than is established in section 1 for a large or a small barrel, respectively; and any person guilty of a violation of any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be liable to a fine not to exceed \$500, or imprisonment not to exceed six months, in the court of the United States having jurisdiction.

Sec. 5. That prosecutions for offenses under this act may be begun upon complaint of local sealers of weights and measures or other officers of the several States and Territories appointed to enforce the laws of the several States or Territories, respectively, relating to weights and measures.

Sec. 6. That this act shall be in force and effect from and after the 1st day of July, 19—.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if there is a report accompanying the bill?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I will make a very brief statement concerning it. Within a couple of years, I think, we passed a bill to standardize barrels. That bill was designed primarily for the standardization of barrels used in the fruit trade. A department of the Government—I think, the Treasury Department—has held that it applies to lime. In the lime industry the barrels vary in size from about 150 pounds to 200 pounds and upward, the consumer having no means of knowing what he is getting. Unquestionably lime barrels should be standardized.

The bill to which I have referred, and which has already been passed, goes into effect on the 1st of July, and will penalize the lime people unless they adjust their barrels to the standard fixed, which is not anywhere near the lime standard. So it is desirable, if it can be done, in addition to standardizing the lime barrel, to pass this bill before the 1st of July, that the lime manufacturers and dealers may be relieved of the penal provisions of the other bill, and to give them time to adjust themselves I have added an amendment, which will be read shortly, and which provides that the penal provisions of this bill shall not go into effect until the 1st of next January.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, does the other bill, which covers the matter of fruit barrels, cover also barrels for every other product except lime?

Mr. CLAPP. It has been held by the department to cover barrels for all dry products. I have no doubt that experience will show later that there are containers for other commodities which must also be standardized. Of course customs have grown up in connection with different commodities, and in some industries a barrel is used which is not at all in harmony with barrels used in other industries; and yet every lime manufacturer will be penalized on the 1st of July unless he conforms to the standard which has been fixed in the law already passed, which standard, of course, would have to be abandoned immediately upon the passage of legislation similar to that now proposed designed to adjust a standard for the lime business,

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it occurs to me that there must be many other commodities which will come under the provisions of the law already passed and which will have to be taken care of in some way; but if the Senator thinks this bill important, I shall not object to its consideration.

Mr. CLAPP. I do think this bill important in view of the position the lime manufacturers and dealers will be placed in under the clause of the other bill, unless this bill is passed before the 1st of July.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not object.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota whether there is any provision in this bill limiting its operation to lime sold in interstate commerce? I do not recall hearing any provision of that kind as the bill was read.

Mr. CLAPP. It is not designed to apply, and it can not apply, to the commodity except when sold in interstate commerce.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of course there is no limitation confining it to interstate commerce, for we have the explicit constitutional power to establish standards of weights and measures.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator that we have some extensive lime manufactures in the State of Washington. I have not heard a single word from those interested in that State urging any legislation of this kind or referring to it in any way, shape, or form. I do not feel like letting this bill pass without an opportunity to inquire of them as to whether they know anything about it.

I find that the methods of doing business in a good many ways are different on the western coast from what they are on the Atlantic coast, and sometimes legislation is passed especially suitable to carrying on business in the East that is quite an injury to the people on the Pacific coast.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the reason why the Senator has probably not heard from his constituents on this subject is that this legislation has been asked for by the National Association of Lime Dealers and has their approval. It came to me through the Bureau of Standards, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. JONES. I do not believe that a delay of a day or two will affect this matter, and I shall have to ask that the bill go over until I can telegraph to those interested in my State.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the Senator withdraw the report. Then he can resubmit it.

Mr. CLAPP. I will have to ask unanimous consent to withdraw it. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 6054) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroads to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 6055) to amend section 2 of the act approved April 19, 1908, being an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6056) providing for a budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 6057) granting a pension to John H. McTeer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 6058) to reappoint Henry Harrison Hall a second Lieutenant in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 6059) to further amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 6060) granting an increase of pension to Charles Asa Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6061) granting an increase of pension to William H. Waitman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 6062) granting a pension to Mary E. Roberts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 6063) authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe rules and regulations regulating the use of storage reservoirs on navigable waters of the United States to prevent their endangering or impairing navigation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 6064) granting an increase of pension to Louis A. Allor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 6065) granting an increase of pension to Nelson L. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 6066) granting an increase of pension to James H. Colby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 6067) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Walter Reed, Surgs. James Carroll, Jesse W. Lazear, and Aristides Agramonte; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 6068) granting a pension to John C. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) to authorize the President to appoint a commission to cooperate with the American-Norwegian Chamber of Commerce in promoting commercial relations of the United States with Norway; to the Committee on Commerce.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE TRIBUNAL.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. As it is short, I will ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, authorizing the creation, with other nations, of an international peace-enforcing tribunal or tribunals for the determination of all international disputes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed to the several States of the Union with recommendation that they adopt the same by vote of their respective legislatures:

"PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

"The President is authorized to negotiate, and after ratification by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, to sign a treaty or treaties with all or a part of the other sovereign nations of the world, engaging the United States to submit for final determination all its international disputes threatening war, to an international tribunal or tribunals, and also engaging the United States to assist in supplying funds for the support of said tribunal or tribunals and of any international civil and military establishment to be controlled by an international authority that may be required by the treaty or treaties as a sanction for the execution of the decrees and the fulfillment of the demands of the said international organisms when such decrees or demands are made in conformity with the agreements instituting said organisms, and engaging the United States to recognize the authority of said international organisms (or one or more of them) to make final interpretation of the powers conferred upon them."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I venture to suggest that that constitutional amendment has a very good chance for passage, because it seems to carry an appropriation with it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that it is a fine constitutional amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment authorizing the Postmaster General to grant to any employee in the Railway Mail Service in first and second class post offices or in the City Free Delivery Service not to exceed two weeks sick leave in any one year with pay, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADY submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for study of methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes from \$5,000 to \$15,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R.

12717), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment providing in the eradication of the foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals for the payment of any losses and expenses sustained or incurred by the owner or owners of any animal or animals destroyed in the arrest or eradication of any of such diseases, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 449) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

FLOOD CONTROL.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the so-called Humphreys bill (H. R. 14777), providing for flood control, which passed in the House of Representatives yesterday, has come to the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has not been received by the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to make a statement regarding that bill. There will be a motion made, when the bill comes to the Senate, to refer it to the Committee on Interstate Commerce; and the understanding between the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and myself is that the question of reference will not be disposed of before next Monday.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I would not like to say that, Mr. President. It will not be disposed of until further conference with the Senator from Nevada. If we have an opportunity to consider it at an earlier period, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That will be satisfactory. I wish to state in that connection, as many Members understood—

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is asking for the regular order. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

CHARLES L. FREER.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I have been recognized.

Mr. STONE. I have a bill I desire to introduce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have passed the order of the introduction of bills, but the Chair will recur to that order.

Mr. STONE. The Secretary is standing in such a position with reference to mine and that of the Vice President that I did not hear—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill, and I have been waiting for the Chair to get to a point where I could do so.

Mr. KENYON. I am willing to yield for that purpose, of course.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Chair whether it is necessary for the Senator from Iowa to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, of course, had passed the order of introduction of bills and joint resolutions and was down to about the close of the morning hour, and recognized the Senator from Iowa; but the Chair can see no reason why the Senator from Iowa will not yield for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Missouri to introduce a bill.

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. I offer the bill which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the title of the bill.

The bill (S. 6068) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel and remit a certain income tax assessed against Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, Mich., was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in connection with that bill, I desire to have printed in the Record, without reading, in order that the matter may be conveniently preserved for use by the Committee on Finance, to which this bill has been referred, and for the information of the Senate, a letter to me from Dr. Charles D. Walcott, Secretary of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I should have liked to have had inserted in the Record certain other correspondence sent to me

from Dr. Walcott, which accompanied a note from him to me, which for some reason he has marked "personal," and therefore I do not ask to have it inserted in the Record; but I will ask to have these papers referred, with the bill, to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done.

Mr. STONE. The letter I now send to the desk I ask to have printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, May 17, 1916.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your verbal request, I have the honor to submit herewith the following information relative to the cancellation of the assessment of the income tax which Mr. Charles L. Freer is called upon to pay on profits derived from the sale of certain capital stock of Parke, Davis & Co., which sale was made solely for the benefit of the Smithsonian Institution and the proceeds immediately appropriated to its interests, in carrying out the provisions of his munificent gift to the Nation, the extent of which has been more than doubled since his original offer.

Of the proceeds of this sale \$1,000,000 in cash was delivered to the Institution in December, 1915, to be applied to the erection of the building forming part of the donation; in addition to which, art objects purchased since the sale and already transferred by title to the Institution have cost Mr. Freer more than the balance realized by him in the disposition of the stock in question.

Under date of May 14, 1916, Mr. Freer writes that, besides other purchases made for the Institution, a considerable sum from other sources than the sale of this stock has been set aside by him for further acquisitions and for contingent expenses, and if the Government insists upon his paying the income tax on the sale of the Parke, Davis & Co. stock he will feel constrained to deduct the amount of the tax, \$13,252.21, from the fund referred to, which would, of course, be equivalent to taking it from funds available for additions to the collections which he has presented.

The original proposition of Mr. Freer was made to the President of the United States in a communication dated December 15, 1905, in which he offered to bequeath or make present conveyance to the Smithsonian Institution or the United States of his extensive collections of American and oriental art, together with the sum of \$500,000 for the construction of a building for their installation. This offer was accepted on behalf of the Nation by the Board of Regents of the Institution at their annual meeting on January 24, 1906, and was carried out in the form of a deed of gift dated May 5, 1906. The accompanying inventory enumerated 2,326 objects.

Since that time, however, Mr. Freer has continued to make additions of equal importance to the collections, which have been conveyed to the Institution in seven supplementary transfers, covering approximately 3,010 objects, and bringing the total to approximately 5,336 examples, of which 1,012 are American and 4,324 are oriental. The collection as a whole is one of the most remarkable in the world, being especially noteworthy in its representation of the work of Whistler and several other celebrated American artists, and of the unstudied art of China, although the arts of Japan, Korea, Persia, Indo-Persia, Egypt, and other oriental countries are widely and richly illustrated, beginning with periods antedating the Christian era.

It is impossible to state the value of these collections. The oriental works were mostly obtained by Mr. Freer in the countries which they represent, and their valuation has greatly increased since his collecting began, which has always been carried on regardless of expense. If placed on sale, they would certainly bring not less than two and a half million dollars, and probably much more.

In view of the increased cost of building operations in recent years and of the increase in the size of the collections, Mr. Freer has augmented the sum provided for the erection of the building from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000, which entire amount is now in the possession of the Smithsonian Institution, while the plans for the building have been completed and accepted.

I am transmitting with this letter a copy of Bulletin No. 70 of the National Museum, entitled "The National Gallery of Art," in which the Freer gift is described on pages 102-119.

In view of Mr. Freer's generosity in presenting his magnificent collections to the Nation and of the purposes for which the proceeds of the sale of the stock mentioned are to be used, as above explained, I trust that the cancellation of the tax will meet with the approval of Congress.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES D. WALCOTT,
Secretary.

The Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

PROCEEDINGS OF EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire at this point to call up a bill I introduced two or three days ago, at which time I asked that it might lie on the table, with a view to having it referred; and before it is referred I desire to occupy a few minutes of the Senate's time to say something about it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. On yesterday Senate resolution 191 was before the Senate, and, by unanimous consent, it went over until to-day, in order to accommodate the Senator from Missouri, who said he desired to speak upon it. I was on my feet to ask that that resolution be now taken up, as I had the right to do under the rule. Of course, I realize that if it is talked out until 2 o'clock it will go to the calendar, and that is why I am anxious to have it taken up and discussed now. I am always glad—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no wish at all to be in any way unfair to the Senator. I desire to say something upon that resolution. I do not wish it talked out and then go to the calendar.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator—

Mr. STONE. I desire, if the Senator will permit me, to have the resolution reasonably debated, and to have an expression of the Senate as to whether or not executive sessions shall be abolished. If the Senate desires to have that done, I have no objection.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that unanimous consent was given yesterday that this resolution should go over without prejudice, in order, as I understood, to accommodate the Senator from Missouri, who desired to speak on it. The Senator from Missouri desires to discuss something else at this time. If we can have unanimous consent that this resolution may go over until the next day without prejudice, I shall be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. STONE. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I should not like to undertake this morning to discuss the resolution.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator any objection, then, to the course I suggest?

Mr. STONE. I have absolutely no objection to its going over until the next morning hour and taking it up then; and I promise the Senator I shall be ready then to say what I desire to say.

Mr. KENYON. That is very agreeable. I ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution 191 may go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over without prejudice.

MONUMENT TO ALEXANDER W. DONIPHAN.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill (S. 6023) I introduced two or three days ago for the erection of a monument to Gen. Alexander W. Doniphan be now laid before the Senate, and I wish to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is that the bill be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. STONE. Upon that motion I desire briefly to be heard. I desire to make a short address—one that I especially want the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to hear.

A short time since I was attracted by a brief—a very brief—descriptive article in the Washington Post, ornamented with a picture of Gen. Doniphan. The picture was the thing which especially called my attention to the printed matter, which was only a brief explanation published under the picture. I will read what the Post said:

Exactly 70 years ago Alexander William Doniphan, an American Army officer, led 1,000 soldiers into Mexico, settled an Indian uprising, crossed two deserts, defeated two armies that outnumbered him 4 to 1, captured the intrenched city of Chihuahua, lost 4 men killed and 14 wounded in a year's campaign that covered almost 6,000 miles, and returned home with 17 of the enemy's cannon and 100 of his battle flags. His name appears in none of the standard histories of the United States. He was a country lawyer, and soldiering was his hobby.

There are two things about this publication I have just read to which I wish to refer—one being what I fear might in a way have an erroneous or misleading effect and the other being an omission. First as to the error: The error, or possible error, is that the Post article states that Gen. Doniphan was an American Army officer. That is not wholly erroneous, of course, but is calculated to convey a wrong impression. It is likely to create the impression that he was an officer of the Regular Army; and that would be a mistake. He was only an officer of the Volunteer Army.

The omission I wish to supply is this, that the Post fails to tell its readers what State Gen. Doniphan was from. He was, during the greater part of his life, a citizen of the State of Missouri; from that State he volunteered for service in the Mexican War; the men he led in that war were Missouri men, whom he induced by his patriotic appeals to enlist; and to-day he lies buried in a beautiful but unostentatious Missouri cemetery. I supply this omission for the reason that I doubt whether one-half or one-third even of the Members of Congress know anything about this man or remember his honored name. It is stated in the Post article that "his name appears in none of the standard histories of the United States."

After reading that Post article I sent over to the Congressional Library a request to have all histories in that great collection of books which might be considered "standard histories of the United States" examined, and to advise me in what historical books his name appears and in what way it appears. All I was able to get in reply to my request was a reference to a chapter of less than 38 pages in a volume entitled "The Road

to Glory," written by E. Alexander Powell—a volume containing numerous sketches of thrilling and important events in American history, concerning which little or nothing has been said in the so-called "standard histories" of our country. I will ask the Secretary to read the first two pages of this remarkable and absolutely true historical reminiscence—I might almost say this historical revelation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE MARCH OF THE ONE THOUSAND.

Twenty-two centuries or thereabouts ago a Greek soldier of fortune named Xenophon found himself in a most trying and perilous situation. Lured by avarice, adventure, and ambition he had accepted a commission in a legion of Hellenic mercenaries, 10,000 strong, who had been engaged by Cyrus to assist him in ousting his brother from the throne of Persia. But at Cunaxa Cyrus had met his death and his forces complete disaster, the Greek legionaries being left to make their way back to Europe as best they might. Under Xenophon's daring and resourceful leadership they set out on that historic retreat across the plains of Asia Minor, which their leader was to make immortal with his pen, eventually reaching Constantinople, after an absence of 15 months and a total journey of about 3,500 miles, with little save their weapons and their lives. Xenophon's story of the March of the Ten Thousand, as told in his "Anabasis," is the most famous military narrative ever written; it is used as a textbook in colleges and schools, and is familiar wherever the history of Greece is read.

Yet how many of those who know the "Anabasis" by heart are aware that Xenophon's exploit has been surpassed on our own continent, in our own times, and by our own countrymen? Where is the textbook which contains so much as a reference to the March of the One Thousand? How many of the students who can glibly rattle off the details of Xenophon's march across the Mesopotamian Plains have ever even heard of Doniphan's march across the plains of Mexico? During that march, which occupied 12 months, a force of American volunteers, barely a thousand strong, traversed upward of 6,000 miles of territory, most of which was unknown and bitterly hostile, and returned to the United States bringing with them 17 pieces of artillery and a hundred battle flags taken on fields whose names their countrymen had never so much as heard before. Because it is the most remarkable campaign in all our history, and because it is too glorious an episode to be lost in the mists of oblivion, I will, with your permission, tell its story.

Mr. STONE. With this introduction Mr. Powell proceeded to give in graphic phrase the wonderful story of "The March of the One Thousand," let by Doniphan.

There is one other book giving an account of this "march," printed under the title of "Doniphan's Expedition." This is a small volume, written soon after the Mexican War by John T. Hughes, A. B., himself intimately and most honorably associated with this heroic expedition. This volume of Mr. Hughes, little more than a pamphlet, long ago went out of print, and copies of it are rare and difficult to obtain. About two years ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and I were talking of Gen. Doniphan, and Senator CATRON asked me if I had a copy of Mr. Hughes's account of the Doniphan expedition. I told him I had some years ago seen a copy of it. The Senator from New Mexico, who is a native Missourian, and who had spent his childhood and the years of his younger manhood in the vicinity of Gen. Doniphan's residence, and knew him personally, felt a natural concern about the regrettable fact that the services of this great American had been apparently forgotten. We were in complete sympathy about that. Together we conspired to have the historical booklet, so interestingly written by Mr. Hughes, republished as a Senate document, and that was done. Except for the chapter in Mr. Powell's work and Mr. Hughes's publication, it would be difficult to find any authoritative account of Gen. Doniphan's life and achievements, save, perhaps, a brief mention in biographical encyclopedias.

Mr. President, you could hardly find a more striking illustration of the old adage that "republics are ungrateful." I will not now intrude long enough upon the courtesy and current business of the Senate, at a time when time is so important, as to give an outline of the services rendered his State and country by this great Missourian. In what I have had read from the account given by Mr. Powell of "The March of the One Thousand" you will find a sufficient and very true index to the nature, extent, and value of the services Gen. Doniphan performed in that very important epoch in American history covered by the Mexican War. But that is far from being a complete account of the valuable and distinguished public services he rendered at other times and in other ways. If this man had lived in ancient times and then performed the feats of valor and wrought the achievements he did for his country's glory and good, he would have been one of the classical figures of the world's history. More, if he had lived in the older States of this Union, especially in New England, where, seemingly—and I speak it to their honor—the people have a higher regard for the perpetuation of the names of their great men than have the rest of us—if he had lived in New England, instead of on the border of our civilization, or what was then in fact the American frontier, his name and deeds would have been written about in prose and poetry, perhaps even more than Paul

Revere, and his stalwart figure, which was indeed heroic and splendid, would long since have been immortalized in marble and bronze. But as he only rode out of the then far West into the still farther West, and farther still for a thousand miles into what is even yet a foreign, if not hostile, country, bearing his banners always to victory against desperate odds, his name, instead of being immortalized, has been almost left out of history, or referred to only in a most casual way, and it has been permitted by the American people that he should be in substantial effect forgotten by his countrymen.

Gen. John Joseph Pershing is the gallant leader of another daring expedition now in Mexico. The very country covered by the Pershing expedition—an expedition full of thrill and danger—was covered by Doniphan's expedition 70 years ago.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there is nothing that I have heard to show by what authority this gallant soldier went down into Mexico. I think the RECORD ought to show whether he went there as a freebooter or filibuster or how he went. I think we ought to know that.

Mr. STONE. He went as a part of the Volunteer Army, in the Mexican War, primarily under the command of Gen. Kearny, who went on through to California. But the Senator's inquiry illustrates what I have been saying about the forgetfulness of our really good, appreciative, and warm-hearted American people.

It is a source of infinite State pride to me that the leaders of both these remarkable expeditions to which I refer belong to Missouri and that they are manhood contributions made by my State to the glory of the Republic.

Mr. President, if it be within my power to rescue from oblivion the memory of Gen. Doniphan, this great old Missourian, than whom no finer specimen of American intellectual, moral, or patriotic manhood ever lived, it shall be done; and I know of no better way to bring that about than to have this Republic—which ought to be grateful to him—erect here at its Capital a suitable monument expressive of the Nation's appreciation of his services and as an inspiring lesson to the youth of the whole land who flock here every year to look—I am rejoiced to say—with admiration and reverence upon the heroic figures of men who have performed heroic services to their country.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Library Committee, and if that committee, of which the scholarly and distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is the chairman, will report the bill to the Senate, and if the Senate can be induced to consider it, I will take occasion then to lay before this honorable body a more extended account of the services of Gen. Doniphan, thus showing not only how well he deserves this tribute but how ashamed we should be that he has been so grossly neglected by the Nation and the people he served so faithfully and well.

Mr. CATRON and Mr. LIPPITT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the morning business is closed, I was going to ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a motion pending to refer the bill to the Committee on the Library. It is a debatable question, and the Senator from New Mexico has the recognition of the Chair on that motion.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then I understand the morning business is not closed.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, as Col. Doniphan, sometimes called Gen. Doniphan, because he held both ranks, one as a militia general in Missouri, the other as a colonel of Volunteers in the United States, did more than any other man toward the acquisition of New Mexico by the United States and putting it into an organized shape so that it could be recognized and put into action as a community under the laws and Constitution of the United States, and as I am a native of the State from which his expedition started to New Mexico, and one of the companies which belonged to his expedition came from the county where I was born and where I lived, I feel that it is proper for me to say something upon this motion and upon the bill which has been introduced.

Col. Doniphan's memory is not unknown in Missouri nor in New Mexico. It needs no monument to resurrect it in those two States. Every man, woman, and child who is capable of reading and talking knows of Col. Doniphan in those two States. He was a pioneer and came from pioneer ancestry. His father was born in Virginia, went to Kentucky and joined Daniel Boone, where Doniphan was educated and admitted to the bar as a lawyer.

Immediately upon being admitted to the bar he removed from Missouri and took up his residence in the county of my nativity, at Lexington, in the county of Lafayette, where he resided some two or three years. During the time he was there, owing to some

possible difficulties that existed between the Mormon settlements and the other people of northern Missouri, he was appointed a brigadier general in the militia and had control of matters pertaining to those troubles. He was always a man who desired peace, and he so managed the affairs connected with those difficulties that no blood was shed, peace was kept, and harmony prevailed between the Mormons and the other people of Missouri. About three years after he settled in Missouri he moved to Clay County, where he was residing when the Mexican War was commenced.

He was a man exceedingly eloquent and prepossessing in his appearance. He was able to excite and thrill an audience. He possessed an immense amount of magnetism. When that war commenced, volunteers having been called for to the number of 50,000 by the United States, he started out through the different counties adjacent to that in which he lived, made speeches in them, and in eight of those counties raised companies which formed his regiment. They met at Fort Leavenworth in June, 1846, where they were sworn in and he was elected colonel of the regiment. They were placed under the command at that time of Col. Kearny, afterwards made brigadier general. His regiment consisted of eight companies, comprising 856 men. The entire expedition of Gen. Kearny consisted of 1,658 men. In less than 60 days they traversed the plains about 1,000 miles to Santa Fe and entered it, without shedding a drop of blood. Doniphan's command headed the column on entering Santa Fe.

On the 18th day of August, 1846, immediately after they went into camp Gen. Kearny designated Col. Doniphan to prepare a code of laws to prevail in the provisional government of New Mexico, which he at that time established. Col. Doniphan employed as his assistant Private Willard P. Hall, of the company from his county—Clay. Private Willard P. Hall afterwards served three terms—six years—in the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri. They prepared a code which was given to Gen. Kearny, who was the general at that time, which was declared to be the laws of the Territory, and was forwarded to the Government of the United States at Washington to be approved, most of which is still a part of the statutes of New Mexico. It was approved, and since I have come into the Senate, on my request, that has also been printed as a Senate document.

After remaining at Santa Fe a short time Gen. Kearny was ordered to proceed to California, but not to take his entire command. He designated the portion of the command which afterwards came to him under Gen. Price to remain in New Mexico. He first directed Col. Doniphan to make an expedition into the Navajo country to subdue those Indians who were then at war with the people of New Mexico; then to proceed to the city of Chihuahua and to report to Gen. Wool, who had been directed, under general orders which they had at that time, to proceed into Mexico and to take possession of the State of Chihuahua. Doniphan went into the Navajo country with six of his companies, rounded up that nation, which is the largest and probably the most warlike Indian nation that this country has ever had, compelled them to enter into a treaty of peace, the only peace that the Navajoes ever entered into. They were willing to enter into that peace treaty because they felt that there was some one else coming into the country who was able to protect them and guard them against the depredations of the Mexicans who had gone into that country before. In fact, a warfare of depredation only had been going on for 200 years in New Mexico between the Navajo Indians and the people of Spanish descent residing there.

A treaty of peace was made with those Indian, and they remained at peace until the breaking out of the war between the States, when they thought they might be able to drive all whites out of New Mexico, and they then made a combination with the other Indians and commenced war.

Col. Doniphan, after the making of that peace, immediately proceeded to the State of Chihuahua. In going there he encountered, with his command, which then consisted of about 1,100—there had been added to it a battery of Artillery and another company belonging to the lieutenant colonel who traveled with him, but was not of his regiment, making his command nearly 1,100—about 2,500 or 3,000 Mexicans at a place called Brasitos, 20 or 30 miles north of El Paso, in the present State of New Mexico, and defeated them without the loss of a single man to Doniphan's command and with a loss of a large number of Mexicans. He followed them rapidly into the city of El Paso, or the city of Paso del Norte, for El Paso did not then exist, being the place now called Juarez. There he had another slight engagement with the Mexican forces, won the fight, and took possession of the city of Juarez, or of Paso del Norte, and held it for two or three weeks, when he moved on to the city of Chihuahua. About 15 miles north of the city of

Chihuahua, with his eleven hundred men, he encountered about 4,500 of the Mexican Army. He had six pieces of artillery, commanded by Capt. Weightman, who returned to New Mexico after the Mexican War, and on the organization of the State government at that time was elected a United States Senator to this body, but was not allowed to be admitted because the State was not admitted under the constitution which it formed. Capt. Weightman was afterwards a prominent officer in the Confederate Army, and was killed at the Battle of Wilsons Creek, in Missouri. I belonged to his command at the time.

Doniphan met these 4,500 Mexican soldiers at a place called Sacramento. He did not hesitate for one moment when he came in sight of them. He deployed his men, moved around them, attacked them both in front and rear, and, with a loss of but 2 men killed and 9 or 10 wounded, dispersed them, killing something like two or three hundred Mexicans and wounding probably twice as many more. He drove them into the city of Chihuahua, the next day taking possession of it and holding it. It was there that he expected to report to Gen. Wool, but he did not find him. Wool, five days before, had been engaged in the Battle of Buena Vista under Gen. Taylor. Wool had been ordered not to come to Chihuahua, but that order had not reached Doniphan or Gen. Kearny, and therefore Doniphan went on, expecting to report to Wool, but, not finding him there, he proceeded within a week or two afterwards down by way of Buena Vista and Saltillo and by the capital of Coahuila on to the Gulf of Mexico.

By this time the year's service of his men for which they had enlisted had expired and he was ordered to take them home. Before leaving the city of Chihuahua he wrote a communication to Gen. Wool, having learned that Wool had been engaged in the Battle of Buena Vista, at which place they learned of that battle, and, among other things, he said in that letter that Gen. Taylor had been designated as "Old Rough and Ready." He stated that all of his men were entitled to that designation, but could go Gen. Taylor one better—that they were not only "rough and ready," but they were also "ragged."

It is a historical fact no clothing was issued to Doniphan's expedition from the time they left Leavenworth until they reached home, 12 months afterwards. They obtained their provisions en route from the time they left Santa Fe until they reached the Gulf of Mexico, where they took shipping back by way of New Orleans and by the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to their homes. Their horses and other live stock they fed upon the grasses of the plains.

That expedition, out of 856 that composed the regiment of Col. Doniphan, did not lose exceeding 56 men in the entire expedition, and more than half of those remained in Santa Fe to help start and build up that government.

Doniphan was a man who was entitled to immense credit. Everyone in Missouri loved him. He did not seek office. He served two terms in the Missouri Legislature, being elected both times without having himself requested to be designated as a candidate. He was tendered the office of brigadier general in the Confederate Army and refused it. He was always true to the American flag. He always believed in the permanency and perpetuity of the Constitution of the United States and the Union of this Government.

It was my pleasure to know him intimately, personally. Several times I heard him address audiences on the stump. I once asked him why he did not accept the tender of the brigadier generalship in the Confederate Army. He replied, "I have lived in a community nearly every member of which sympathized with the southern people"—that is the community where he was living when the war between the States commenced—"but," he said, "my education, that of a lawyer, has been upon the Constitution of the United States, in part, and I have learned to revere it; I have learned to believe that that Constitution was intended to effect a permanent and perpetual union of the States; I did not believe that the Union ought to be severed; I did not believe that it ought to be broken up and weakened. For that reason I was unable to accept a commission in the Confederate States' Army, although I sympathized with those who were in that cause. I believe that my duty to my Government was such that I should, at least, do nothing to tear it down."

This was the character of Doniphan throughout his entire life, so far as I knew him—and I knew him for about 20 or 30 years before his death; in fact, he was one of the board of curators of the University of the State of Missouri at the time I graduated. That was where I first met him and came in contact with him.

I believe that this bill ought to pass; but, as I have thought about it, I have come to the conclusion that the monument ought to be erected to the memory of "Doniphan and his

men," because he had a lot of men—856 of them—the whole of one company of which I knew as well as many members of other companies, who were unsurpassed in character, energy, intelligence, morality, and courage by any men that this country or any other country has ever produced. They were men who believed in the Government of the United States and its institutions; they believed whenever they were called to defend it or act in behalf of it that it was their duty to go and to act, and their conduct throughout that whole campaign showed what they thought and what they were. They are entitled to credit, and if this bill passes, I think eventually that the name of every man who belonged to that regiment and to that command ought to be somewhere engraved upon the monument.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico takes his seat, let me ask him in relation to the very interesting remarks which he has made if he has put into the RECORD anywhere the name of the author of the history of Col. Doniphan's expedition?

Mr. CATRON. That has been put in the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was not on the floor at the time.

Mr. CATRON. John T. Hughes was the author of the history. He was one of the commissioned officers of Doniphan's command.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am glad that it will be in the RECORD.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I only desire to add a word to what has been so well said. The heroic character of Doniphan and the heroic achievements of Doniphan's men ought to be commemorated. As a Missourian, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very eloquent and forceful remarks. The State of Missouri is interested deeply in paying proper tribute to the memory of the gallant Doniphan and in commemorating his deeds in a suitable and proper way. My colleague [Mr. STONE] has so well presented this bill that I only desire to say that I am in the most hearty accord with the sentiments of the bill, and with the remarks made by both the distinguished Senators who have preceded me.

Mr. STONE. I withdraw the motion to refer the bill, and ask that the bill be referred under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

RIVER REGULATION AND FLOOD CONTROL.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, on the 11th of April I made some remarks, which appeared in the RECORD, upon the subject of river regulation and flood control, and I then had inserted in the RECORD the telegram from the New Orleans Association of Commerce addressed to Hon. William C. Redfield regarding the flood situation, the necessity for immediate action, the pledges of the Democratic Party, and the assurances given by the President upon this subject. I also had inserted in the RECORD recommendations made to the President by Secretaries Franklin K. Lane, D. F. Houston, and William C. Redfield, of the Interior, Agricultural, and Commerce Departments, respectively, indicating the form of organization that water development, in their judgment, should take. That recommendation was afterwards concurred in by Mr. Baker, the present Secretary of War. I alluded in that statement to the legislative situation, referring to the fact that there had been long pending in this body a bill introduced by myself, generally known as the Newlands-Broussard bill, and another bill fathered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. I referred in that statement to this bill introduced by myself, which is general in character, embracing every watershed in the country, and providing for coordination of bureaus and services now engaged in work regarding the development or use of water, cooperation with the States, and an ample fund for consecutive work; and also referred to the so-called Ransdell-Humphreys bill, which related simply to the lower Mississippi.

I also referred to the organization by the House of a Committee on Flood Control, which took jurisdiction over rivers, theretofore covered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I referred to the question of jurisdiction, urging that inasmuch as the very basis of all this legislation was the power of the Nation over interstate commerce, and as every scheme of development of these rivers must include the promotion of navigation and of interstate commerce, the jurisdiction of these bills attached to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, rather than to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, in continuation of the remarks made at that time, and with a view to making a statement now that can be read by those who wish to take part in the consideration of my motion to refer the bill which has just come over from the House, called the bill for flood control, to the Interstate Com-

merce Committee instead of the Commerce Committee. I wish to ask leave to insert in the RECORD my correspondence with Mr. HUMPHREYS relating to this legislation, as well as the bills themselves.

I wish to state in that connection that it was assumed that the supporters of the Newlands-Broussard bill and of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill would unite in accepting the recommendations made by these departmental chiefs after full consultation with us.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. In order that I may follow the Senator's discussion, I should like to inquire whether the bill that passed the House is the one known as the Ransdell-Humphreys bill?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is known as the Humphreys bill. I believe the same bill was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL].

Mr. KENYON. And the Senator's bill is known as the Newlands-Broussard bill?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

I say, it was assumed that the supporters of those bills would unite in a bill embodying the recommendations of the departmental chiefs. That was clearly the understanding, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and myself were concerned, with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL]. Mr. HUMPHREYS was detained by illness and was unable to be present at the conference of the departmental chiefs, but it was assumed that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] spoke for him. Later on it developed that this was a mistake; but, in pursuance of the original understanding, as I supposed, I collaborated with the Secretary of Agriculture and his solicitor—an excellent lawyer, and skilled in bill framing—regarding a bill which would embrace the recommendations made, after consultation with us, by the departmental chiefs; and I sent this bill to Mr. HUMPHREYS, with the suggestion that it would expedite legislation if he would introduce it in the House and I would introduce it in the Senate. I was surprised to receive a reply declining to introduce it in the House, and the result was that I have not introduced it in the Senate but have offered it simply as an amendment to the river and harbor bill.

I immediately took hold of the old Newlands-Broussard river-regulation bill, however, reduced its size and dimensions, withdrew all those portions providing for liberal appropriations, and for an ample fund, and confined the bill mainly to the recommendations of the departmental chiefs, with, however, some variation as to the Mississippi River, substituting for an appropriation of \$45,000,000 for work upon the Mississippi River a total appropriation of \$60,000,000 divided between all the watersheds of the country, with \$25,000,000 of it apportioned to the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, thus providing for a continuous, highly developed waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I object to the Senator occupying the time further at this point, even for a motion to refer. It is not debatable until 2 o'clock. There is nothing pending before the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask, then, the letters to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not any objection to that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that another sentence would have finished my remarks, and it was entirely unnecessary for the Senator from Arkansas to intervene.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the letters referred to will be published in the RECORD.

The letters referred to are as follows:

APRIL 8, 1916.

Hon. B. G. HUMPHREYS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HUMPHREYS: I have been in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Solicitor of the Agricultural Department with a view to framing a bill which would put in concrete form the recommendations to the President made by the interdepartmental committee, consisting of Secretaries Lane, Houston, and Redfield, after submission to and approval by Senators RANDELL, BROUSSARD, and myself, at a meeting at which, unfortunately, you were unable to be present.

These recommendations have been forwarded to you and to myself by the President, and were read by me into the record of my remarks at the recent hearing before the Flood Control Committee.

Secretary Houston was of the opinion that the passage of a comprehensive measure would be simplified and expedited if we could agree upon a tentative bill to be introduced by yourself in the House and by myself in the Senate at the same time, and that the committees of both the Senate and the House could proceed with such a tentative bill as a basis and reach a speedy conclusion.

Would you kindly look over the bill inclosed and make such suggestions and alterations as you think advisable, and let me know whether it would be agreeable to you for us to introduce whatever bill is agreed upon, on the same day?

I can not urge upon you too strongly the importance of uniting with the specific indorsement of the Mississippi and Sacramento River projects, a comprehensive plan of administrative coordination, including all four of the departments, which will facilitate the gradual development of all the watersheds of the country and the conservation of our water resources.

I am sure that any bill which fails to equally recognize all the departments or which confines legislative action entirely to one or two watersheds will arouse so much antagonism that the passage of such a bill at this session would be impossible.

Very truly, yours,

FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1916.

Hon. F. G. NEWLANDS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEWLANDS: Your letter of April 8, inclosing draft of bill prepared by you in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and the solicitor for that department is received, and I have read it with much interest.

I am sorry that I can not agree with your view in this matter, but I am quite certain that the Committee on Flood Control would not consent to the creation of such an overhead commission as is suggested. I think it will be entirely possible to frame a bill which will comply with the recommendations of the Cabinet officers in their note to the President, in most of its essential elements, but I can not bring myself to the belief that it would be desirable in any aspect of the case to have the four executive departments mentioned attempt to do the work which ought to be under one executive head.

After a great deal of study of this question and very general conferences with the membership of the House of all political faiths, I have arrived at the conclusion that no bill would have the remotest chance of passage which undertook to deal with the matters provided for in your bill in a manner so thoroughly comprehensive.

Hoping, should the House pass the bill which will be reported by the Committee on Flood Control, that you will find it possible to give it your support in the Senate, and with many thanks for your interest in the matter and your courtesy in forwarding me the copy referred to,

Very truly, etc.,

BEN. G. HUMPHREYS.

APRIL 12, 1916.

Hon. B. G. HUMPHREYS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HUMPHREYS: I regret exceedingly to learn that you do not feel that you can support the recommendations of the interdepartmental committee, consisting of Secretaries Lane, Houston, and Redfield, regarding the coordination of the Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, in which are gathered all of the various engineering and scientific services that relate to the control, development, or beneficial use of water.

I regard this as a vital point in the proposed legislation. These various services must be coordinated in some way if we are to enter upon a comprehensive development, and as they can not be gathered together in one department, I can imagine no better way than through the organization of a waterways council or commission, composed of department chiefs, with the President at the head, thus keeping the Chief Executive in practical touch with the work of all of the various coordinated services.

Believe me, very sincerely, yours,

FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.

The bills referred to are as follows:

THE HUMPHREYS BILL AS IT PASSED
THE HOUSE MAY 17, 1916.

An act (H. R. 14777) to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Cal., and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That for controlling the floods of the Mississippi River and continuing its improvement from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River the Secretary of War is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to carry on continuously, by hired labor or otherwise, the plans of the Mississippi River Commission heretofore or hereafter adopted, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$45,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$10,000,000 shall be expended therefor during any one fiscal year.

(a) All money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for controlling the floods and for the general improvement of the Mississippi River, and for surveys, including the survey from the Head of the Passes to the headwaters of the river, and a survey of the Atchafalaya Outlet so far as may be necessary to determine the cost of protecting its basin from the flood waters of the Mississippi River either by its divorce from the Mississippi River or by other means, and for salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and

THE NEWLANDS BILL INTRODUCED IN
THE SENATE APRIL 24, 1916.

A bill (S. 5736) to promote interstate commerce, agriculture, and the general welfare by providing for the development and control of waterways and water resources, for water conservation, for flood control, prevention, and protection; for the application of flood waters to beneficial uses; and for cooperation in such work with States and other agencies, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$80,000,000, to be apportioned as hereinafter provided, is hereby reserved, set aside, appropriated, and made available until expended, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the "river-regulation fund," to be used to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways of the United States and their connections with the Great Lakes and with each other, and by the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes and transportation, and the establishment and maintenance of adequate terminal and transfer facilities and systems, and their maintenance, improvement, and protection, and by the making of examinations and surveys and by the construction of engineering and other works and projects for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and the standardization of such flow, and by the maintenance of navigable stages of water at all seasons of the year in the waterways of the United

States, and by preventing silt and sedimentary material from being carried into and deposited in waterways, channels, and harbors, and by the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of the United States, and by flood prevention and protection, through the establishment, construction, and maintenance of natural and artificial reservoirs and detention basins for water storage and control, and levees, revetments and other bank-protective works, spillways, wasteways, wasteways, by-passes, controlled outlets, and flood-control works of every nature and kind, and the protection of watersheds from denudation, erosion, and surface wash, and from forest fires, and the maintenance and extension of woodland and other protective cover thereon, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands and arid lands, and the building of drainage and irrigation works in order that the flow of rivers shall be regulated and controlled not only through the use of flood waters for irrigation on the upper tributaries, but also through controlling them in fixed and established channels in the lower valleys and plains and by doing all things necessary to provide for any and all beneficial uses of water that will contribute to its conservation or storage in the ground or in surface reservoirs as an aid to the regulation or control of the flow of rivers, and by acquiring, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, holding, using, leasing, hiring, and transferring by appropriate deed lands and any other property that may be needed for the aforesaid purposes, or which it may be deemed advisable to dispose of, and by doing such other things as may be specified in this act or necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes thereof, and by securing the cooperation therein of States, municipalities, and other local agencies, as hereinafter set forth, and for the payment of all expenditures provided for in this act.

(b) That no money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended in the construction or repair of any levee unless and until assurances have been given satisfactory to the commission that local interests protected thereby will contribute for such construction and repair a sum which the commission shall determine to be just and equitable but which shall be not less than one-half of such sum as may have been allotted by the commission for such work: *Provided*, That such contributions shall be expended under the direction of the commission, or in such manner as it may require or approve, but no contribution made by any State or levee district shall be expended in any other State or levee district except with the approval of the authorities of the State or district so contributing.

(c) Any funds which may hereafter be appropriated under authority of this act for improving the Mississippi River between the Head of the Passes and the mouth of the Ohio River, and which may be allotted to levees, may be expended upon any part of said river between the Head of the Passes and Rock Island, Ill.

(d) No money appropriated under authority of this act shall be expended in payment for any right of way for any levee which may be constructed in cooperation with any State or levee district under authority of this act, but all such rights of way shall be provided free of cost to the United States: *Provided*, That no money paid or expense incurred by any State or levee district in securing such rights of way, or in any temporary works of emergency during an impending flood, or for the maintenance of any levee line, shall be computed as a part of the contribution of such State or levee district toward the construction or repair of any levee within the meaning of paragraph (b) of this section.

That the watercourses connected with the Mississippi River to such extent as may be necessary to exclude the flood waters from the upper limits of any delta basin, together with the Ohio River from its mouth to the mouth of the Cache River, may, in the discretion of said commission, receive allotments for improvements now under way or hereafter to be undertaken.

Upon the completion of any levee constructed for flood control under authority of this act, said levee shall be turned over to the levee district protected thereby for maintenance thereafter; but for all other purposes the United States shall retain such control over the same as it may have the right to exercise upon such completion.

SACRAMENTO RIVER, CAL.

SEC. 2. That for controlling the floods, removing the debris, and continuing the improvement of the Sacramento River, Cal., in accordance with the plans of the California Debris Commission, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to carry on continuously by hired labor or otherwise, the plan of said commission contained in its report submitted August 10, 1910, and printed in House Document No. 81, Sixty-second Congress, first session, as modified by the report of said commission submitted February 8, 1913, approved by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 5, Sixty-third Congress, first session, in so far as said plan provides for the rectification and enlargement of river channels and the construction of weirs, to be paid for as

States, and by preventing silt and sedimentary material from being carried into and deposited in waterways, channels, and harbors, and by the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of the United States, and by flood prevention and protection, through the establishment, construction, and maintenance of natural and artificial reservoirs and detention basins for water storage and control, and levees, revetments and other bank-protective works, spillways, wasteways, by-passes, controlled outlets, and flood-control works of every nature and kind, and the protection of watersheds from denudation, erosion, and surface wash, and from forest fires, and the maintenance and extension of woodland and other protective cover thereon, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands and arid lands, and the building of drainage and irrigation works in order that the flow of rivers shall be regulated and controlled not only through the use of flood waters for irrigation on the upper tributaries, but also through controlling them in fixed and established channels in the lower valleys and plains and by doing all things necessary to provide for any and all beneficial uses of water that will contribute to its conservation or storage in the ground or in surface reservoirs as an aid to the regulation or control of the flow of rivers, and by acquiring, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, holding, using, leasing, hiring, and transferring by appropriate deed lands and any other property that may be needed for the aforesaid purposes, or which it may be deemed advisable to dispose of, and by doing such other things as may be specified in this act or necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes thereof, and by securing the cooperation therein of States, municipalities, and other local agencies, as hereinafter set forth, and for the payment of all expenditures provided for in this act.

The aforesaid sum of \$80,000,000, appropriated as hereinbefore provided, shall be apportioned for expenditure under this act as follows:

(a) \$25,000,000 to the Illinois River and its watershed and to the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Illinois to the Head of the Passes, including the Atchafalaya River as one of the mouths of the Mississippi River, to be expended for the improvement of the Illinois River and for continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Illinois River, for the control of floods thereon, and the establishment of a waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf; (b) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of the Ohio River and its tributaries, for the control of floods thereon, and the consequent improvement of navigation; (c) \$5,000,000 to the watershed of the Mississippi River above the mouth of the Illinois River; (d) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of the Missouri River and all other tributaries of the Mississippi River, except the Ohio, from the mouth of the Illinois River to the Gulf and all rivers draining into the Gulf of Mexico west of the Mississippi River; (e) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of the rivers draining into Canada, the Great Lakes, and the Atlantic Ocean and rivers draining into the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River; (f) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of all the rivers draining into the Pacific Ocean in Oregon and Washington, including the Columbia River watershed; (g) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of the rivers draining into the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and into the Pacific Ocean north of Santa Barbara, in California; (h) \$5,000,000 to the watersheds of all other riv-

appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$5,600,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,000,000 shall be expended therefor during any one fiscal year.

(a) All money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the California Débris Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the control of floods, removal of debris, and the general improvement of the Sacramento River: *Provided*, That no money shall be expended under authority of this section until assurances have been given satisfactory to the Secretary of War (a) that the State of California will contribute annually for such work a sum equal to such sum as may be expended annually therefor by the United States under authority of this section; (b) that such equal contributions by the State of California will continue annually until the full equal share of the cost of such work shall have been contributed by said State; and (c) that the river levees contemplated in the report of the California Débris Commission, dated August 10, 1910, will be constructed to such grade and section and within such time as may be required by said commission: *Provided further*, That said State shall not be required to expend for such work, for any one year, a sum larger than that expended thereon by the United States during the same year: *And provided further*, That the total contributions so required of the State of California shall not exceed in the aggregate \$5,600,000.

(b) All money contributed by the State of California as herein provided, shall be expended under the direction of the California Débris Commission and in such manner as it may require or approve, and no money appropriated under authority of this section shall be expended in the purchase of or payment for any right of way, easement, or land acquired for the purposes of this improvement, but all such rights of way, easements, and lands shall be provided free of cost to the United States: *Provided*, That no money paid or expense incurred therefor shall be computed as a part of the contribution of the State of California toward the work of improvement herein provided for within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the completion of all works for flood control herein authorized the said works shall be turned over to the State of California for maintenance thereafter; but for all other purposes the United States shall retain such control over the same as it may have the right to exercise upon such completion.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

SEC. 3. That all the provisions of existing law relating to examinations and surveys and to works of improvement of rivers and harbors shall apply, so far as applicable, to examinations and surveys and to works of improvement relating to flood control. And all expenditures of funds hereafter appropriated for works and projects relating to flood control shall be made in accordance with and subject to the law governing the disbursement and expenditure of funds appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

All examinations and surveys of projects relating to flood control shall include a comprehensive study of the watershed or watersheds; and the report thereon, in addition to any other matter upon which a report is required, shall give such data as it may be practicable to secure in regard to (a) the extent and character of the area to be affected by the proposed improvement; (b) the probable effect upon any navigable water or waterway; (c) the possible economical development and utilization of

ers in California and the Great Inland Basin and the Colorado River.

NATIONAL WATERWAYS COUNCIL.

SEC. 2. That a national waterways council, hereinafter called the council, is hereby created, consisting of the President of the United States as chairman, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the chairman of the water-control board, to be appointed as hereinafter provided.

The council shall have authority to direct and control all proceedings and operations and all things done or to be done under this act, and to establish all rules and regulations which may, in their judgment, be necessary to carry into effect such direction and control consistent with the provisions of this act and with existing law and with any provisions which Congress may from time to time enact.

All plans and estimates prepared by the water-control board, as hereinafter provided, which contemplate or provide for expenditures from the river regulation fund shall be submitted to the council for final approval before any of the expenditures therein provided for or contemplated are authorized or made or any construction work undertaken or contracts let under or in pursuance of such plans: *Provided*, That in case of an emergency the chairman of the water-control board shall have full power to act, and shall report in detail his action in every case to the council at its next meeting after his action.

WATER-CONTROL BOARD.

SEC. 3. That to assist in carrying out the purposes aforesaid the council may utilize the various agencies of the Government, and there is hereby created a water-control board, hereinafter called the board, which shall consist of a chairman, to be appointed by the council, and four assistant secretaries, to be appointed as hereinafter provided, and such additional members as the council may from time to time appoint. The chairman of the board shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum, each assistant secretary aforesaid shall receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum, and said additional members of the board such salaries as the council may from time to time fix. Subject to the direction and control of the council as to general policy and procedure, it shall be the duty of the board to ascertain in detail the work in progress and obtain plans, recommendations, and estimates of the work contemplated in the general field of water conservation, control, and utilization by the various agencies of the Government, States, counties, municipalities, districts, communities, corporations, associations, and individuals, and on the basis of such information and the results obtained by its own surveys and investigations to prepare for the consideration of the council a general and comprehensive program of water and waterways conservation, regulation, development, and utilization, extending through a number of years, with comprehensive general plans for each watershed, treating the entire watershed of each river as a unit, and with specific projects, plans, estimates, and recommendations, involving independent work by the United States and the combining of resources and energies of the various public and private agencies aforesaid; to coordinate and bring into conference the various agencies of the Government; and to examine, compare, adjust, allot, assign, and supervise their work, to the end that duplication may be avoided and the highest efficiency obtained; by agreement to assign to the various cooperating agencies the work to be done by them within their respective spheres; to accept, on behalf of the United States, from such agencies contributions of money

water power; and (d) such other uses as may be properly related to or coordinated with the project. And the heads of the several departments of the Government may, in their discretion, upon the request of the Secretary of War, detail representatives from their respective departments to assist the engineers of the Army in the study and examination of such watersheds, to the end that duplication of work may be avoided and the various services of the Government economically coordinated therein: *Provided*, That all reports on preliminary examinations hereafter authorized, together with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors thereon, shall be submitted to the Secretary of War by the Chief of Engineers, with his recommendations, and shall be transmitted by the Secretary of War to the House of Representatives, and are hereby ordered to be printed when so made.

In the consideration of all works and projects relating to flood control which may be submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for consideration and recommendation, said board shall, in addition to any other matters upon which it may be required to report, state its opinion as to (a) what Federal interest, if any, is involved in the proposed improvement; (b) what share of the expense, if any, should be borne by the United States; and (c) the advisability of adopting the project.

All examinations and reports which may now be made by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, upon request of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, relating to works or projects of navigation, shall in like manner be made, upon request of the Committee on Flood Control, on all works and projects relating to flood control.

SEC. 4. That the salary of the civilian members of the Mississippi River Commission shall hereafter be \$5,000 per annum.

and property of any kind to be used for carrying out the purposes authorized by this act; to make field inspection of all work done or contemplated under this act by the Government and its cooperating agencies; and to employ such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development, constructors, and other employees, and to construct such buildings and works as may be necessary for those purposes. The board is hereby authorized to expend from the sums herein provided such amounts as may be necessary for services of employees in the city of Washington, D. C., and elsewhere; to pay therefrom such sums as may be necessary for office accommodations in the city of Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and to purchase such law books, books of reference, periodicals, engineering, statistical, and professional publications as may be needed. Contributions received under this section shall be used by the board, under the direction of the council, for carrying out the purposes of this act, and money so received shall be paid into the river regulation fund herein created. Subject to the approval of the council, the board is authorized to enter into such contracts or carry on by hired labor or otherwise such work as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act, within the limits of appropriations made or authorized by this act or appropriations or contributions which shall be hereafter made or authorized from time to time, or as may be necessary for executing projects under this act within the respective limits of cost thereof approved by the Congress, the funds for which shall have been provided by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the authority conferred by this act. Subject to the approval of the council, the board may also employ the various agencies of the Government in carrying out such purposes or executing such projects.

COOPERATION WITH STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES.

SEC. 4. That the board shall, in all cases where possible and practicable, encourage, promote, and endeavor to secure the cooperation of State, municipalities, public and quasi public corporations, towns, counties, districts, communities, persons, and associations in the carrying out of the purposes and objects of this act, and in making the investigations and doing all coordinative and constructive work provided for herein; and it shall in each case endeavor to secure the financial cooperation of States and of such local authorities, agencies, and organizations to such extent and in such amounts as the council shall determine to be a just and equitable apportionment of work, costs, and benefits under all the circumstances in each case; and it shall negotiate and perfect arrangements and plans for the apportionment of work, cost, and benefits, according to the jurisdiction, powers, rights, and benefits of each, respectively, and with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as can be properly undertaken by the United States by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and promote the general welfare, and by reason of its proprietary interest in the public domain, and to the States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as properly belongs to their jurisdiction, rights, and interests, and with a view to properly apportioning costs and benefits, and with a view to so uniting the plans and works of the United States within its jurisdiction, and of the States and municipalities, respectively, within their jurisdictions, and of corporations, communities, and individuals within their respective powers and rights, as to secure the

highest development and utilization of the waterways and water resources of the United States.

APPOINTMENT OF WATER-CONTROL BOARD.

Sec. 5. That each head of a department named in this act is authorized to appoint, with the approval of the council, for service as a member of the board, a highly qualified representative, who shall be an assistant secretary in the department in which he is appointed; shall devote his time primarily to the work authorized by this act; shall have, subject to the direction of the head of the department, such general supervision and control as may be necessary for the purposes of this act of the agencies within the department engaged upon such work; shall serve during good service and behavior; and shall be removable by the head of the department only for good cause.

RIVER-REGULATION FUND.

Sec. 6. That no sums shall be paid out of the river-regulation fund except on vouchers signed by the chairman of the board or by an official designated by him in writing, drawn on the Secretary of the Treasury. To provide for carrying out the projects formulated under this act, which involve expenditures in excess of the \$60,000,000 herein appropriated to the river-regulation fund, the appropriation hereafter to the credit of said fund of such sums as may be necessary is hereby authorized. At any time that the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine it to be necessary or advisable, in order to provide all or any part of the appropriation made or authorized by this act or which may be hereafter made or authorized or to provide revenues to execute a project under this act, which shall have been approved by the Congress, he may issue and sell, or use as a means of borrowing money, bonds in the necessary amount, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. L., 11, 117), the act of February 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 192), and the act of March 2, 1911 (36 Stat. L., 1013). The sums appropriated or provided by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this section shall be paid into the river-regulation fund and shall be available until expended and paid out as provided for in this act. All moneys received in connection with any operations under this act as well as from the sales of materials utilized and any condemned property, shall be covered into the "river-regulation fund" and be available for expenditure therefrom. It is the intent and purpose of this act to authorize and empower the council and the board and their officers, agents, and employees to do all necessary acts and things in addition to those specially authorized in this act to accomplish the purposes and objects hereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of the river and harbor bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12193) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] expects to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall address myself to this bill as a whole rather than to any of its specific items or to any amendment which the Senate Committee on Commerce has reported.

My principal reason for speaking upon the bill at all, if any reason be needed, is due to its general character, to the large aggregate appropriation which it carries, and to the fact that its distribution over so many States through the assembling of so many specific items indicates either a lack of system in the disposal of the public money for the ostensible purpose of improving rivers and harbors, or a deliberate distribution is

designed for the benefit of the different localities where rivers and harbors are located, or to both.

I am not vain enough, Mr. President, to imagine that any criticism of mine will seriously affect the ultimate disposition of the bill, either in its present form or as it may be amended. But inasmuch as I took occasion to submit some remarks upon a bill of similar character at the last Congress, carrying, as I recall a much larger aggregate appropriation than this one, I have decided that it might not be amiss to repeat some of the objections which I then thought were pertinent to the bill, in the hope that their reiteration now, and perhaps hereafter, on similar occasions, might, like drops of water upon a stony surface, make some ultimate small impression.

There is no question that the appropriation of money for the improvement of our rivers and harbors in the interest of navigation constitutes one of the recognized powers of Congress, and a perfectly legitimate and highly desirable subject of public expenditure. The use of our streams and harbors for the development of traffic and the promotion of commerce and industry appeals very properly to every citizen who desires the welfare of this country promoted and its general prosperity increased. Indeed, the universal existence of that sentiment has had much to do with the growth of a system of legislation, manifesting itself in this and other appropriation bills, which not only accomplishes the purpose designed, but which goes farther and satisfies what might be called not only a long-felt but an insatiable want, to wit, the appropriation of moneys for local expenditure founded upon the ostensible purpose but foreign to it. This, in turn, has given rise not only to complaints and criticisms which though making little impression upon our course of legislation has crystallized in the coinage of names applicable to such bills, by which they are now generally, if not universally, known outside the Halls of Congress.

Before speaking to the bill itself, it may perhaps be also appropriate that I should say that the expenditures of the Government, and the alarming increase in their aggregate amount, and what seems to me to be the imperious present necessity of economizing wherever possible and limiting these expenditures as much as existing conditions will permit, constitutes an additional reason for taking the time of the Senate and engaging in this discussion.

It has been a constant and, in some respects, a monotonous practice of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber when bills were under consideration carrying appropriations, and especially when these appropriations were considerable, to remind the Democratic majority of the Baltimore platform, and particularly of that plank which commits the party to a course of economy in the administration of public affairs and which at the same time denounces the reckless extravagance of the Republican Party in that regard. Of course I recognize the practice as perfectly legitimate, and I am obliged also to recognize the fact that the occasions for these reminders are constant and of increasing frequency. I am impressed, Mr. President, with these reminders, but I am much more impressed with the fact that up to this time, at least, they seem to have made little, if any, impression elsewhere. I am impressed with them not alone because of the position which the party to which I owe allegiance has taken upon the subject, but because I perceive no disposition on either side of the Chamber to make this assurance an actuality or any great amount of desire outside of the Chamber on the part of the people in general to insist upon it or even to request it. Indeed, if I am any judge at all of the popular wish with regard to public expenditures, it is that they should be increased instead of being diminished, provided only and always that the increases shall be made in certain desired directions beneficial to this or that section of the country; the decreases, if any, to be made in other directions and designed for other ends and purposes.

Public opinion with regard to expenditures, in other words, is very much like public industrial opinion with regard to the tariff, at least among those who profess adhesion and allegiance to the Democratic theory of protection. It is that economies should be everywhere applied, except with regard to those who are asking appropriations for specific purposes of interest to themselves. These are concerned directly with the appropriations which they wish to see exempted from a general rule of economy, because they are assumed to be essential and beneficial to the interests or to the sections thus involved; and, of course, what is true of one is true of every part of the country. Just as in tariff matters the desire of the woolgrower to be exempted from impost reduction, the desire of the sugar producer for a continuation of his protection, and the insistence of the manufacturer that raw material should be admitted free while his manufactured product should enjoy the beneficent paternalism of the Government expressed in the shape of duties.

These clamoring insistentencies nearly always result in no reductions at all. So in appropriations these varying views and desires, conflicting at first and then combining, result in increased appropriations and larger and larger supply bills.

And such will it be, Mr. President, I am afraid, until our expenditures reach an aggregate so appalling in its magnitude as to force upon the taxpayers of the country a realizing sense of their supreme interest in the expenditure of the public revenues as they should be in its collection, a situation which will be inevitable if we continue our methods of disbursement. For we must tax if we would spend, and if we shall, as I hope, resort to direct and forego indirect taxation, we may be sure that the people will then inquire what we are doing with their money.

I have noticed, too, Mr. President, that those most clamorous for appropriations from the Public Treasury, who are most eager to receive monetary benefits from the General Government, are the identical ones who first rebel and always protest most vociferously against increases of taxation.

It was said in a jocular way some years ago of a certain Member of Congress that his code of political ethics prompted him to always favor appropriations and oppose tax bills. Unfortunately, however, no country can operate upon such a principle and at the same time avoid the courts of bankruptcy. What we expend we must provide. That fund which we devote ostensibly at least to the public good must be gathered from the people of the country and placed in the Federal Treasury. The day comes in every instance when the Congress which appropriates must pay the piper or pass the problem on, and when the self-created necessity of raising added revenue and thus increasing the public burdens faces an administration, which continues its methods of appropriation, the revulsion is bound to come which for the time being at least will enforce a due regard for frugal expenditure.

It is a good thing for the Nation and for us when such a crisis comes. In this period of unexampled and abundant prosperity, when the tides of business have reached a high-water mark never before known to our commercial history, when money is pouring into the land in such prodigious quantities that its fortunate owners are embarrassed in its investment, when the cry of preparedness is abroad in the land, which is the equivalent of added expenditures of enormous amounts, the day of retrenchment is doubtless more remote than it ought to be, but it is coming just the same, and I want to be in a position, as far as I am personally concerned, where I can recall that I have uttered an occasional word of warning and placed myself squarely on record as an advocate of economy in public administration.

I freely concede, Mr. President, that I have introduced many bills calling for appropriations and have voted for many more. I make claim to no superiority either of capacity or of conviction over my associates upon this floor, or to the possession of any greater virtue or conscience. We are all here charged with a public duty, and I am convinced that every Member of the United States Senate in the discharge of that duty is actuated by motives and convictions as sincere and as pure and doubtless as substantial as any to which I can lay claim.

What I have to say upon this subject is therefore dictated neither by any sense of party advantage nor by any impulse which, in my judgment, is more lofty than those actuating the policy and the record of my associates.

Indeed, Mr. President, this leads me to refer to the fact that so far as economy in public expenditures or public administration is concerned there can be no difference whatever between that side of the Chamber and this. If there be any difference except in detail I have not been able to discover it. I think it is therefore perfectly legitimate for me to indulge the conclusion that much of the warning, much of the reminder of the Baltimore platform from the distinguished Senators upon the Republican side of the Chamber, is due to the fact that this side is responsible for the Government that, being in power, our actions do not square with our assertions, and that we must take the responsibility flowing from a disregard of our own pledged promises, and except here and there not to any desire for economy or frugality or even wish it, much less, except in individual instances, to insist that appropriations should be minimized instead of being increased.

The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has addressed the Chamber at some length in opposition to this bill. During the first day which he occupied in that discussion he referred to many of the bills which at this session have been enacted into law carrying appropriations, and in that connection to the platform to which I have just adverted. I do not doubt that he approves the sentiment of that plank in the platform just as heartily as I do. I do not doubt that theoretically at least it finds fitting response in the breast of every Senator.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] last Saturday, speaking upon the same subject, gave some estimates of the amount of money which thus far has been appropriated by the present Congress and of those which probably have to be provided for. I quote an extract from his speech on page 8949 of the Record. He says:

I call your attention to the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress and the estimates for the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress. The Sixty-third Congress appropriated in its two sessions, for the two fiscal years 1915 and 1916, a total of \$2,231,055,150, which was more than double the appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress; and this vast sum of over \$2,000,000,000 does not cover all the money appropriated for the years 1915 and 1916, for it has taken four urgent deficiency bills so far this session, covering \$25,731,229, to make up deficiencies for 1916.

More than that, the estimates submitted to this session of the present Congress for the next fiscal year amounted, for one year only, to \$1,287,857,808. To that you must add the deficiency appropriations of this session, which will go into the report of the next Congress, which will make \$1,311,588,000 appropriated by this session of this Congress for the fiscal year 1917, and that does not include appropriations for several measures which have passed this body and which will no doubt become laws before this session adjourns.

I think—

Says the Senator—

the time has come when we should call a halt upon the extravagance of this administration.

In that I agree.

It came into power under a promise of economy, but the records show that it has been the most extravagant in the history of the country, and the estimates for this year far exceed the estimates that have ever been sent to any Congress in the history of the country.

It is true, Mr. President, that in considering this subject, allowance must be made for the growing demands of an expanding people and an expanding Government. Allowance, too, must be made for the increasing activities of a Government like ours requiring of necessity an expanding growth in appropriations because of them.

So far as that element of increase is concerned no man can find any exception. It is those increases which are not essential or not essential at the present time and those new appropriations which are practically wasted or at least do not bring to the Government the corresponding consideration that should result from their expenditure to which the pruning knife should be applied.

The Senator goes on and declares that—

We, as representatives of the people, should stand for the reduction of taxation and for the strictest economy in the administration of the affairs of the Nation.

Nobody doubts that for a moment. He also says:

We on the Republican side advocate this because it is right, and it is our duty in making appropriations to practice the strictest economy and only make such appropriations as are actually necessary and which will result in benefit to the people.

I think I may say that we on this side of the Chamber also advocate it because it is right. In fact, every man must advocate it because it is right and plainly right, and because there can be no dispute about the proposition.

It is also equally clear, self-evident, indeed, that it is our common duty in making appropriations to practice the strictest economy, as the Senator states.

Now, Mr. President, I quote from the Senator from Kansas not because his remarks are unique, but because his is the latest utterance from that side of the Chamber upon the general proposition. We have heard it elsewhere. While I am not attempting to evade the responsibility which necessarily rests upon this side of the Chamber, I think it is perfectly proper for me to remind Senators upon the other side that if their practices square with their assurances, their warnings, and their reproaches, I think there would be sufficient strength upon this side of the Chamber uniting with them to control the expenditures of the Government in the interest of economy.

While listening to the Senator's utterances it occurred to me that perhaps the record of Republican Senators for economy at this session of Congress might or might not support the contention that as Republicans Senators upon the other side of the Chamber not only urged the necessity of frugality in public expenditures, but squared their conduct with their belief.

I therefore caused an investigation to be made of the number of bills calling for appropriations which have been introduced by each Republican Senator in the Chamber from the first day of the present sessions of the Sixty-fourth Congress to about May 10, with a showing of the total of appropriations asked by each Senator and the aggregate of public moneys demanded by them.

This statement, Mr. President, to which I refer includes only bills asking for specific sums. It could not well include those calling for a "sufficient appropriation" to carry into effect the object of the bill. Neither does it include bills referring cases

to the Court of Claims for adjudication. Bills granting pensions I have computed for the year, and bills granting increase of pensions have been computed arbitrarily upon a basis of 50 per cent increase, which I think is conservative.

The result, Mr. President, does not, to my mind at least, convey the assurance that the Republican Members of this Chamber speaking generally—there are exceptions—have exhibited any greater love for economy than have the Senators upon this side of the Chamber.

Of course, the question may be asked why I did not compute the bills of Senators on both sides. I was well aware, Mr. President, that giving the result of my computation to the Senate the capable and industrious Members upon the other side would spare me the necessity of doing that work by doing it themselves.

I give now, Mr. President, the result of my investigation, taking the Senators in alphabetical order:

Senator BORAH has introduced 57 bills calling for an aggregate appropriation of \$5,064,014.14.

Senator BRADY, his colleague, has introduced 31 bills calling for an aggregate appropriation of \$388,866.15.

Senator BRANDEGEE, 46 bills, with the modest total of \$8,306.

Senator BURLEIGH, 100 bills, calling for an aggregate appropriation of \$26,970.

Senator CATRON, 69 bills, aggregating \$1,053,577.15.

Senator CLAPP, 61 bills, calling for \$785,672.11.

My genial friend, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], is entitled to the unique credit, including the Senators on both sides, of introducing only 6 bills, calling for \$1,363.

Senator COLE, of Rhode Island, has introduced but 3 bills, calling for \$2,860.

Senator CUMMINS, 48 bills; total amount asked for, \$142,163,237.47. I should say in this connection, however, that two of the Senator's bills, each for \$69,000,000, seem to be duplicates, although offered at different times, designed to make appropriations for the same purpose; that is, to increase the efficiency of the National Guard.

Senator CURTIS, 263 bills, calling for \$246,642.37.

Senator DILLINGHAM, 25 bills, calling for \$5,507,698.

Senator DU PONT, 21 bills; aggregate amount, \$54,528.50.

Senator FALL, 10 bills, \$1,271,013.

Senator GALLINGER, 47 bills, aggregating \$4,799,650.

Senator GOFF, 13 bills, aggregating \$6,726.

Senator GRONNA, 13 bills; total, \$301,660.

Senator HARDING, 29 bills; total amount asked for, \$19,839.69.

My distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. JONES], who has frequently read to us the celebrated economy plank of the Baltimore platform, has introduced 203 bills, calling for \$23,573,345.51.

Senator KENYON, 8 bills, aggregating \$69,606.20.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, 22 bills; aggregate, \$541,256.

Senator LIPPITT, 15 bills; aggregate, \$2,796.

Senator LODGE, 27 bills, calling for \$2,281,919.12.

Senator McCUMBER, 88 bills, calling for \$11,351,968.54.

Senator MCLEAN, 187 bills, the total amount asked for being \$314,130.86.

Senator NELSON, 39 bills; total asked for, \$16,046,131.48.

Senator NORRIS, 16 bills, calling for \$17,035,220.

Senator OLIVER, 24 bills, calling for \$312,327.50.

Senator PAGE, 12 bills, \$132,636.

Senator PENROSE, 234 bills, calling for \$587,383.16.

Senator POINDEXTER, 34 bills; total, \$6,013,266.70.

Senator SHERMAN, 102 bills; amount, \$973,900.51.

Senator SMITH of Michigan, 69 bills, calling for \$285,918.14.

Senator SMOOT, 50 bills, calling for \$479,708.03. To that, Mr. President, should be added the Senator's proposed substitute for the highway bill providing for the issue of bonds in the modest amount of \$500,000,000. That added to my distinguished friend's total puts him in the same position with regard to appropriations that he enjoys otherwise as the acknowledged and capable leader of the minority in this body, a position he has fairly earned by his genius for hard, constant, and unremitting industry.

Senator STERLING, 20 bills; total, \$380,914.

Senator SUTHERLAND, 13 bills, \$256,057.50.

Senator TOWNSEND, 51 bills, \$18,622.52.

Senator WADSWORTH, 10 bills; total, \$251,366.81.

Senator WARREN, 38 bills; total, \$5,702,732.61.

Senator WEEKS, 37 bills; total, \$214,271.85.

Senator WORKS, 38 bills; total, \$52,934,015.03. To that must be added the Senator's amendments to the good roads bill, one calling for \$100,000,000 to be used in the purchase of property between here and the White House and the other calling for \$600,000 to be used in the purchase of Snow Court, the demolition of its buildings, and the erection of suitable and desirable structures to be rented to tenants. The total, inclusive of addi-

tions proposed to the road bill, is \$301,462,207.65. Adding to these the other items I have mentioned, our friends who clamor for Democratic economy on the other side of the Chamber have up to date offered bills which, if allowed, would call for an aggregate appropriation of \$902,062,207.65.

But I want to be fair about this matter, and, therefore, one of the bills of Senator CUMMINS duplicating the other, and each calling for \$69,000,000, should be deducted from this aggregate, leaving, therefore, the modest sum of \$833,062,207.65 for appropriations requested.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. I have a list of the numbers of each of the bills introduced by the Senators, which I think will confirm the estimate made here, and to which Senators are entirely welcome if they care enough about this proposition to see whether the figures and the numbers are correct. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I simply wanted to ask what was the bill of my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] which the Senator referred to as carrying \$69,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. It was designed to increase the efficiency of the National Guard. It was introduced twice, on each occasion calling for the same amount.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I was merely going to say to the Senator that he must know not one-tenth of 1 per cent of those appropriations asked for will be allowed by this Congress. Does he not know that?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not, Mr. President. Of course, I know that the great majority will not be allowed, but what were they introduced for? For recreation?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator knows why many of them were introduced. Among them are bills that have been introduced each Congress, I suppose, for the last 20 years calling for the same appropriations. I myself can not say why they are so introduced. As far as the appropriation of \$500,000,000, introduced by myself as a substitute for the good-roads bill, is concerned, I did not introduce it; I offered it as an amendment, and it would not have taken a dollar of appropriation from the Government Treasury. In that particular I think the Senator has overdrawn the condition. For instance, bills which have been introduced asking for appropriations have been duplicated by other Senators asking for exactly the same thing.

I am quite sure, if the Senator will follow out the appropriations proposed to be made from the list he has just read, there will not be at the end of the session one-tenth of 1 per cent of them that will become laws.

Mr. THOMAS. I trust, Mr. President, that my friend will prove to be a prophet.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. THOMAS. I always yield with pleasure to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator if he can account for the fact that the bill for \$69,000,000 for the National Guard did not get through.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it was largely due to the argument made on the floor by the Senator from Idaho on the subject of the National Guard. It convinced me, and I am hopeful that it induced the Senator from Iowa to withdraw one of the two duplicate bills from consideration, and the other had its own way.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he himself believes that what he has just read in regard to Senators is a fair and honest statement to judge the question of economy or extravagance?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it depends upon the viewpoint from which the question is asked. If the Senator was here when I stated my purpose in offering this memorandum he will recall that I said that in view of the many warnings the Republican side of the Chamber have uttered against the extravagance of this side I thought it were well if it could be shown that they had conformed to their preaching, and that it might, therefore, be illuminating to ascertain how much, not only in the aggregate, but in detail, had been the demands upon the Treasury in the way of bills introduced in this body for

consideration carrying appropriations. I think it is perfectly fair from that standpoint, Mr. President, if indeed it be not in others. If it is not I should like to have the Senator point it out.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, the Senator has included, has he not, authorizations as well as appropriations?

Mr. THOMAS. I have included all bills calling for specific amounts. There are bills which, of course, call for appropriations, though not mentioning specific amounts. Those could not be included. On bills for increase of pensions I have made an arbitrary calculation of 50 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. There is a difference between authorizations and appropriations. I have now in mind—and I want to ask the Senator about it—

Mr. THOMAS. There is very little difference when it comes to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there is a great deal of difference. I have a particular bill in mind, and I want to ask the Senator whether such a bill would be included. I have introduced a bill for the development of Great Falls out here near Washington—

Mr. THOMAS. That has been included.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any appropriation in that bill, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. But there is an authorization of an appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the Senator from Nebraska knows—at least, I think he knows—much better than I, if the development of hydraulic power at Great Falls is to be made effective, it will require more than the amount which he in his bill proposes to authorize for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator from Colorado likewise knows—and I am satisfied he will admit it, for I believe he is just as fair as I am—at least, I think the Senator wants to be fair—

Mr. THOMAS. I am obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for his good opinion.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any appropriation, for instance, in that bill; and the Senator knows, as I said, as well as I do, that if the work were begun to-day—and if the Senator does not know it he can get that information from the reports of the engineers who made the investigation—that it will take five years to complete it.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President; I admit that.

Mr. NORRIS. And the appropriations, when it comes to making appropriations, will be divided up.

Mr. THOMAS. But at the end of five years the Senator will discover that his authorization is far too small.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be; and the Senator will likewise admit that in a proposition of that kind, assuming it to be successful—and I believe the Senator himself thinks it would be successful—the appropriation, if any were made, would in its very nature be reimbursable, and all of it would be returned to the Treasury; and that, as a matter of fact, it would be an act of economy in behalf of the people of Washington, who have to use electric light and electric power on electric railways.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the Senator from Nebraska through?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator another question about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. I introduced that bill, and I offered it in a modified form as an amendment to a pending bill; and in another modified form I again introduced it. Now, I should like to ask the Senator whether in his calculations he has included that bill in all its different forms?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will tell me what amount is authorized by his bill I will answer the question.

Mr. NORRIS. It is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$15,000,000, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. I have here a list of the bills introduced by the Senator, of which Senate bill 711 carries \$15,021,600. There is another bill—Senate bill 3202—the amount of which is \$2,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. For what purpose is that bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I should have to refer the Senator to the bill. I have not a copy of the bill here.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator if he will take that bill as an illustration?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator does not know, I do not, I am sure.

Mr. NORRIS. We will take that as an illustration. Does the Senator cite that as an instance of extravagance, and does

the Senator believe that indicates a tendency toward extravagance?

Mr. THOMAS. I cite anything as extravagance or as a tendency toward extravagance which at the present time is not imperatively demanded in the public interest.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, then, if that be his position, is opposed to any improvement, or to any advancement, or to any development of any of the resources of the United States that are under the control of Congress?

Mr. THOMAS. That is the Senator's conclusion, but not mine.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I will admit that.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think so.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think we ought to appropriate for anything except salaries or for the payment of debts that the Government owes?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes. I have voted for some other things myself. As I said some time ago, I am not setting myself up as at all superior to my associates upon this floor regarding this subject, and I expect to vote for a great many other money bills.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator thinks, for example, that the particular case I have referred to—the development of Great Falls—is an evidence of extravagance, and he offers that, does he, as a defense of the Democratic Party for its extravagance?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am now sure that the Senator from Nebraska was not here and that he did not do me the honor to be present during my introductory remarks; otherwise he would have realized that such was not the case. I have once stated my purpose to the Senator. If he wishes me to do so, however, I shall repeat it.

Mr. NORRIS. I have heard all that the Senator said. I have been here during all the time he has been speaking.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I have been unfortunate in my expressions and have been unable to convey what I had in my mind by the language which I used.

Mr. President, I have stated that the main purpose for which this tabulation was made was to inquire whether, in view of that record, the constant reminders to this side of the Chamber of our extravagance and of the necessity of economizing could not be very well assisted and aided by the example of those who so remind us, and particularly in the demands which they themselves have made upon the Treasury. Now, the Senator certainly comprehends that.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me to answer that, or rather to hold up to view those who are in favor of economy, I will say that the Senator from Colorado cites instances such as I have cited and other instances of bills introduced by other Senators—for example, the one he referred to which was introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], a bill that provided for a reorganization of the Army, that would necessarily require a great deal of money, and the Senator from Colorado, therefore, thinks, as I take it, that the Senators who have introduced such bills are inconsistent, when, on a "pork-barrel" bill like this one, they are trying to cut down the expenditure of the public money for the purpose of putting water into dry creeks and floating boats up harbors that have not water enough in them to water a steer—

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator from Nebraska think that I am defending this bill?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not suppose that the Senator is, but he is criticizing the men who are finding fault with its extravagance.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no, Mr. President; I am not singling out anybody on that side of the Chamber. Far be it from me to make any invidious comparisons. I have given the totals, and I want to say to the Senator that some of my brethren upon the other side have been so extremely modest in their demands upon the Treasury that I can find no words which are sufficiently superlative to express my admiration of the fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator believe because a Senator does not introduce bills asking for large appropriations, though he would perhaps be in favor of voting for every extravagant amendment or every extravagant item in this bill, that therefore he is an economist, and that the man who has introduced a bill for the reorganization of the Army, let us say, or the reorganization of the Navy, which necessarily must cost many millions of dollars, is an extravagant man because he believes that by reorganizing either of those branches of the service he might bring about some adjustments in the way of efficiency and perhaps in economy as well?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I have not made my purpose clear to the Senator from Nebraska by this time, I shall despair of doing so at all.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I am willing to yield to everybody, Mr. President, one at a time. I think, however, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has been on his feet for quite a while, and if the Senator from Utah will permit me, I will first yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is very kind. I was not present when the Senator from Colorado read those lists to the Senate, and I had the curiosity to go and look at what he accredited to me. I find that the largest item is an amendment which I introduced for the payment of the French spoliation claims. It is not likely to be extravagant, because the point at which the United States Congress always saves is in the payment of just debts.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. One moment. I introduced the same amendment in an amended form—because there were errors in the first amendment—for the same amount, and the Senator has counted both amendments in his estimate. Now, I venture to think that the total—there is only an error of a million dollars in the Senator's estimate—is not serious.

Mr. THOMAS. That does not amount to anything in the National Congress in these days.

Mr. LODGE. But the whole thing was for only a little over a million dollars; and it appears in the list as \$2,000,000, which, perhaps, is not exact.

Mr. THOMAS. My secretary made the computation for me, and he is generally a very accurate man.

Mr. LODGE. He is perfectly accurate, but he has made the estimate on two amendments, when the two amendments are for precisely the same thing.

Mr. THOMAS. In that case, of course, the correction should be made.

Mr. LODGE. I think if the Senator will examine the matter, he will see that both amendments are for the same thing.

Mr. THOMAS. I will take the Senator's word for it. That will reduce the total by a million dollars, upon the Senator's word.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I do so with pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am charged with introducing bills amounting to 60 per cent of the \$900,000,000. I want to say to the Senator from Colorado that, if I secure an appropriation of \$30,000 during the entire session of Congress, it will be more than I expect.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the Senator probably goes upon the principle that he will not get any more than he asks for.

Mr. SMOOT. And upon that basis the other 40 per cent introduced on this side of the Chamber would be \$20,000, and out of the \$900,000,000 of bills stated by the Senator as having been introduced by Senators on this side of the Chamber. If other Senators get the same percentage which I hope to get on what is charged to me, we shall secure about \$50,000 this session of Congress. That is the situation as it exists, although I do not believe that \$50,000 will cover the amount that will be actually appropriated.

The Senator from Colorado knows that I have studiously avoided asking for any appropriation that I thought was in any way wasteful or extravagant. When I came to the Senate I made up my mind that I should never vote for a claim that I myself would not pay under similar circumstances if the claim was against me. I have taken that position, and I think I have lived up to it carefully. I only mention this to show how unfair, in my opinion, are the figures cited by the Senator, in that they do not show what will be appropriated.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, of course I anticipated that this tabulation would not only provoke interruption but comment; and I am satisfied that it will be followed by explanations which will be satisfactory in general, and certainly to those who make them.

I have no desire to do any injustice to anyone or to make any statement that can be fairly subjected to the charge that it is unjust regarding this all-important subject. I think that those who live in glass houses sometimes indulge in the throwing of stones only to imperil themselves; but, as I have stated, my general purpose was merely to show the trend of bills for appropriations, proceeding as well from those who denounce Democratic extravagance as from those who are responsible for Democratic extravagance.

Of course I know, everyone knows, that the majority of these bills will not be enacted, just as everyone knows that the majority of the bills introduced on this side of the Chamber will

not be enacted, not only because many of them can not command a majority upon their merits, but also because the aggregate of appropriations may in any event be so great as to deter even the most reckless legislator from its contemplation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is a most capable, conscientious, upright, and invaluable public servant. So far as I am able to judge, he has been pretty nearly right on everything he has advocated or stood for in this body, except those matters which relate to party principle and party convictions, and, of course, such a man as he would necessarily sustain them, and he has done so. I am not accusing him of extravagance. The Senator believes—and he is right about it—that the development of the Great Falls project would result in great benefit to this community. There is no question about that. It is also true that his bill does not ask for a direct appropriation, but the fact is that this enterprise, upon which he has set his heart and which is as beneficial and as valuable, in my judgment, as the Senator has so frequently declared it to be, will call for a great deal more money than the amount mentioned in the bill. I think that, having waited for this improvement for some time, we can afford to wait a little bit longer.

Just now the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has called my attention to the fact that the bill which swells his aggregate of appropriation into the millions—not many millions, however—has reference to the French spoliation claims. Well, Mr. President, the French spoliation claims have been the subject of renewed consideration for over a century and the money for the payment of them has never been obtained from the Treasury of the United States. Why, I do not know; but certainly those claims are so ancient in character that at this time they can afford to wait a little longer, it seems to me, instead of our making appropriations, or even considering appropriations, for them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Referring to the particular bill which accounts for most of the extravagance which the Senator has charged against me, I want to ask him if he did not vote for it himself when we had a roll call on it several days ago?

Mr. THOMAS. I should not wonder at all if I did. I vote for pretty nearly everything the Senator sincerely advocates. It seems impossible, however, to get out of the Senator's mind that I am not occupying any "holier-than-thou" attitude with regard to these matters. That is not at all my position.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the Senator has used—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS. Always.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, after describing these extravagant propositions, as he terms them—

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know that I used that expression.

Mr. NORRIS. Embraced in pending bills has said—and I think I can quote his words—that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

Mr. THOMAS. I said that; yes.

Mr. NORRIS. He puts every man who has introduced a bill providing for the expenditure of public money, if he be a Republican, in a glass house; but if he be a Democrat he surrounds him with a guard, I suppose, which will prevent any attack being made on him.

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all, Mr. President. I am here to say—and it is nothing new, because I have said it before—that the Democratic majority of this body and of the other House has not regarded the party pledge with respect to the economic administration of public affairs. I have said, and I say again, that the criticisms made on that subject upon the other side of the Chamber are often legitimate. I want, however, to see some action upon the other side commensurate with these criticisms, to the end that we may, possibly through Republican aid, get somewhere in the matter of a reduction of expenditures.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to refer the Senator now to another bill which he has cited as an example of my extravagance and to ask him a question about it. If that bill, together with the one for the Great Falls project, be eliminated, there is practically nothing left of his charge, so far as I am concerned. The bill to which I now refer provides for an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for carrying out the plan outlined in the bill for Federal assistance in the treatment of tuberculosis, and applies particularly to the States of Colorado, California, New Mexico, and Arizona, which States have been overburdened by a large

immigration coming to them from other parts of the United States under the idea and belief that people afflicted with tuberculosis could be cured there. The result has been that in some localities in the Senator's great State, as well as in the other great States I have mentioned, the afflicted persons become public charges. The hearings before the committee of this body show that thousands and thousands of such persons die because they are unable to get away and are unable to pay the expense of their support and their care in a proper way. Many of them live in very poor boarding houses and other places, where they are herded together in large numbers. The bill proposes that in those States in cases of that kind, where a resident of another State has come in and is unable to get away on account of poverty, the United States shall bear half of the expense of his care, provided the State, under proper rules and regulations, to a certain extent standardizes its sanatoriums and other places where tuberculosis patients may be kept and properly treated. Does the Senator believe that is an evidence of extravagance, and does he think that that is the opinion of the people in his own State, who, I believe wrongfully, are compelled to pay a great many expenses of this kind on account of sick persons who come there from other parts of the United States and spend the last dollar they have, perhaps, to get to Colorado, and are unable to care for themselves or to pay for proper care after they reach the State?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President, I do not think that is extravagance. I do not think that a single bill which the Senator has introduced is an extravagance. I think every bill which the Senator has introduced calling for an appropriation is, in his judgment, very essential to the public welfare. I am opposed to that particular measure for two reasons, one of which has reference to the power of Congress to pass it, and the other of which has reference to its application. I know that my own people, so far as I am able to judge from information received, are not at all friendly to it, there being here and there an exception; and I must assure the Senator that because it applies to my State in conjunction with some others would be no reason why I should vote for it, although the tendency is that way, and I have frequently voted for measures because of their local benefit.

Now, I want to remind my friend, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], with reference to his \$500,000,000 substitute for the good-roads bill, that I voted for it and I believe it is a much better measure than the one which finally passed the Senate. I am glad the Senator offered it. That bill was the result of long and painstaking investigation, the product of a man of great ability, who had devoted years and years to working out the scheme, and, in my judgment, it is the road bill which should be adopted, if we are going to adopt a road bill at all. I say that frankly. I think the Senator has been the means of reducing a number of appropriations here, and has also protested, on several occasions to my certain knowledge, against the enactment of some other appropriations which did not commend themselves to his judgment; but I must totally dissent from the proposition that, if his substitute had become a law, it would not have placed a burden upon the Treasury. True, it calls not for money but for credit, but the issuance of \$500,000,000 of bonds, albeit they are exchangeable for State bonds carrying a higher rate of interest, nevertheless, Mr. President, is a burden upon the Treasury at present to the extent to which the exchanges may be made.

Nor do I think that because bills are introduced, first at one session and then at another, because they have not been enacted into legislation, is any particular defense for their introduction at the present time, if those who introduce them really believe that we should at the present time exercise as much economy as possible in regard to public expenditures.

I think it was the Senator from Nebraska who referred to the fact a few moments ago that the funds involved in the construction of the Great Falls project would ultimately result in reimbursement to the public of the amount of money required. That is probably true. We have a number of so-called revolving funds in the Treasury, and we make appropriations out of those revolving funds; but, generally speaking, Mr. President, they do not revolve very far. The machinery essential to the perfect work of the revolution does not seem to be properly oiled or lubricated. It may work out in time, but up to date very few of them have proceeded beyond the first revolution, and there they will probably stick for a good while. That is particularly true, I think, of appropriations coming from the various Indian funds, which are subject, of course, to appropriations for Indian purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was engaged in committee when the Senator began his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry the Senator was not present, and I regret that I did not postpone reading the amount involved in the bills which the Senator has introduced until his committee work had been concluded.

Mr. WARREN. I freely forgive the Senator. I am sorry I was not present during the whole of the Senator's interesting remarks. I feel greatly obliged to the Senator, however, for taking up so freely and conscientiously this interesting subject. It is one that ought to be taken up oftener and by various and numerous Senators. I think we ought to give the Senator from Colorado a vote of thanks, first, because he has introduced a subject which it is most interesting to hear him discuss—and his remarks are always interesting—and, second, because it will tend to economy. I especially, however, think we ought to thank him for calling the attention of his own party to the fact that they have not fulfilled their many preelection pledges regarding economy.

So far as the reference to bills which I have introduced is concerned, I am not certain that I know just what list the Senator has. A moment ago at his desk I was shown what purported to be a list embracing a total of about \$5,700,000, of which \$5,000,000 was credited to a bill providing for the erection of an aviation school. I do not at this moment recall introducing a bill of that kind. I only hope I have done so, because, if we are to have military preparation or any improvement in military matters, there is nothing so important as aviation.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, I can not tell the Senator offhand what the bill is. These calculations were made for me—

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And not by me; but I think they were made very carefully. I imagine, however, that the Senator has not introduced so many bills appropriating \$5,000,000 but that he would have some recollection of this one. It is the only one carrying that amount I find on the list.

Mr. WARREN. I think the record I saw on the Senator's desk shows 38 bills introduced by me.

Mr. THOMAS. Thirty-eight bills, of which that is the only one carrying such a large amount.

Mr. WARREN. If I did not introduce it, I am sorry that I did not.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator will find that he introduced it.

Mr. WARREN. But the total of the Senator's charges as to what the bills introduced by me call for would leave about \$700,000 for every purpose and for all purposes. I feel that I ought to apologize to my State and to my constituency for not asking for more. When a great State like the one I have the honor to represent in part asks for less than \$700,000, including everything, I feel that I have hardly done my duty.

Mr. THOMAS. I will remind the Senator that the session is young yet; and I am quite sure that his success in securing appropriations for his State in the past, during the long period of his public service, will cause his people to overlook his present relapse from duty, if such relapse has occurred.

Mr. WARREN. That avowal, which becomes a matter of public record, will help me somewhat.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. And also the intimation that I may be permitted liberty to involve the Government in some further expense hereafter.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, there is plenty of time.

Mr. WARREN. There does not seem to be, however, any particular opportunity for me to get in on the measure now before us—the rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Would the Senator like to "get in"?

Mr. WARREN. I think we ought to connect the city of Denver and the city of Cheyenne, the capitals of our respective States, by water in some way. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. I am quite sure that a canal between the two cities, our State having gone "dry" and the Senator's State still being "wet," would be patronized by a volume of traffic which would make that now existing on the Mississippi look like 30 cents. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I have found, in traveling in Japan and China, that in perfectly dry country they build canals for many a mile. To put a canal over that 110 miles and connect those

two capitals would certainly be a more tenable proposition than some of the items that are contained in this river and harbor bill; and I hope the Senator will think about it.

Mr. THOMAS. I quite agree with the Senator, although I am not going to vote for the bill for that or for any other reason, and I suppose the Senator will support it.

Mr. WARREN. No.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I am greatly interested in the Senator's statement about bills introduced. I sent and secured the large ones that the Senator charged up against me, though I think my aggregate is quite modest.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure it is.

Mr. KENYON. One of those bills was for \$5,000 to be paid to William T. Roche in compensation for injuries received as a rural carrier. This man, in the performance of his duties as a rural carrier, lost both of his hands.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator is a good deal more modest than I have been.

Mr. KENYON. He is a man with a family, and I think it is an outrage that that bill does not pass.

Mr. THOMAS. I am inclined to agree with the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Another one was in regard to the destruction of \$1,985 in currency where a bank burned up. I introduced that bill to reimburse these people, which would be no loss at all to the Government. The other is a workingmen's compensation act for the District of Columbia, and provides \$55,000 for a number of years to carry on that work.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is necessary.

Mr. KENYON. Those are the large items to which the Senator has called attention. Now, probably that one could wait. I have not urged that large appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. I am satisfied that the Senator has been modest to a degree in the demands upon the Treasury that he has made in his bills.

Mr. KENYON. I think perhaps I might be criticized in regard to some of the pension bills I have introduced, though I confess that my feelings as to the soldiers of the country are such that I do err there sometimes. I can not scrutinize very carefully bills to care for these men in their old age. That is a constantly diminishing payment. But a few years more can we do anything for them.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not offering criticisms of particular bills, except as I am compelled to do so in this running course of comment. The Senator's explanation of these bills, which is perfectly satisfactory as regards those to which he calls my attention, reminds me, however, of a fact which I think he will concede—that every measure calling for money from the Treasury is defended upon the ground that it is essential for that particular object, and essential now; also, that in itself it amounts to comparatively little, and therefore will not make any material difference in the aggregate of appropriations.

In that way, Mr. President, we are led to make expenditures the aggregate of which is enormous. We forget that the combination of a few sums produces a result which is frequently not only out of all proportion to estimates, but so large as to be positively startling. The accumulation of money is something to which very few pay heed unless their attention is specifically directed to it. Few of us recall, except when reminded, that some of the greatest corporations in the world to-day, and certainly in this country, depend for their expenses and their dividends upon the receipt of small amounts of money from enormous aggregates of population.

For example, the subway in New York, capitalized at hundreds of millions, paying large dividends and employing a great many people, has a revenue prodigious in amount, but made up of 5-cent pieces. The nickels of the millions, accumulated in the coffers of that great corporation, produce at the end of each year an aggregate sum of money which the imagination can not grasp and of which the mind can hardly conceive; and those who were far-sighted enough to realize that fact are those who have benefited by and through the organization and control of the corporations to which I refer. What is true of them is true of the administration of public affairs, and always will be true.

Mr. President, let me say that this tendency to the increase of public expenditures is not peculiar to the present Congress or to the preceding one. It is not peculiar to the Congresses preceding the Sixty-third. It has been a growth in constant, sometimes increasing and sometimes decreasing, progression, but a constant growth from the inception of the Government, and it is one of the things for which Congress is only in part responsible; for I affirm that the people of this country do not in

the mass require economy in the administration of their financial affairs. The constituents of the Senator from Wyoming, the constituents of the Senator from Iowa—some of whom doubtless are denouncing him for opposing this identical bill—my own constituents, the constituents of every Senator in this body, the constituents of the Representatives at the other end of the Capitol, are constantly besetting us and them, in season and out of season, demanding appropriations for this, that, and the other object. It has gone to such an extent, Mr. President, that State lines are disappearing, and the States themselves are surrendering their prerogatives and their sovereign power in exchange for appropriations from the National Treasury.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Senator if the decreases that he mentions have not been infrequent and confined to periods following a war or some emergency of that kind? Has not the rule been an increase every year, with those few exceptions?

Mr. THOMAS. They have generally followed panics. But they have been increasing constantly; and the avidity of the public for Government money grows by what it is fed upon.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, Mr. President; and without wishing to differ with the Senator altogether, it is going to go on continuously in the future. The country is growing. The country is going to exact more and more. It is going to get more and more. There is no use in charging it altogether to any political party.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not.

Mr. WARREN. Although, as a matter of fact, the Senator will admit that since the change in the last two and four years the increase has been greater in percentage; but I presume that is because those who were in the minority were hungry, and, when they became a majority, demanded the loaves and fishes which they had been waiting for. We must recognize that, and they have been more extravagant than those who preceded them, but all have been extravagant.

My own opinion is that we can not protect ourselves altogether, and should not protect ourselves, perhaps, against some growth in expenses. It is simply a matter of judgment as to how much of that increase we are going to say is necessary and how much is not necessary; and the Senator is very properly calling our attention to expenditures in which he thinks we are traveling too fast.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator is absolutely correct when he says that neither of the great parties of this country, no party that has ever been in power in this Government, except in the sense that because it is in power it is responsible, is actually responsible for the large increase in public expenditures. Congressmen, like other people, are human, and they yield to pressure; and in these days when the popular conception of our Government is that it is a huge reservoir of money, to be paid out to each and every man who desires it or who needs it, it is perhaps a subject of remark that we have not been more extravagant than has been the case.

I may say in this connection, however, Mr. President, that I think the very large immediate increase was more apparent in the administration of President Roosevelt than at any time before or since. I think during his administration the civil service was increased in number by one or two hundred per cent, and the various activities which the Government entered upon during the administration of that very active President naturally increased the amount of expenditures, and consequently the amount of our appropriations. But there, too, was a yielding to that public pressure which, constantly exerted, necessarily finds ultimate expression in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I am deeply interested in the philosophy which the Senator propounds concerning the American people and their desire or want of desire for any economy and their desire to have their money spent. I can agree with the Senator from Colorado, I think more perhaps than with any other Senator in this body, generally, but I can not believe that can be true. If that is true, when we meet in conventions, both parties representing the people and fresh from the people, conversant with their ideas and what they want, why do we say, both parties—your party said in the Baltimore platform, as we will say in the Chicago platform—that we are in favor of economy and a reduction of offices? If that is not what the people want, why do we say that?

If the Senator is correct, why do we not say in our platforms that we will appropriate all the money we can raise by any form of taxation and go to the people on that kind of a

platform? Does the Senator believe that any party could win on that platform?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no. Macaulay once said that you could practice wickedness and immorality with impunity, but the moment you began to preach it your doom was sealed.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator believe that the American people are not in favor of any economy? Does he believe that the public conscience of our people is such that if a State or a district can get appropriations out of the Public Treasury that is all the people care about?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, Mr. President, I will try to answer that, but I can not answer it categorically. There is an old saying with regard to some men that they are "in favor of the law but against its enforcement." Now, I have not any doubt that the people theoretically are in favor of economy. I have not any doubt that their indignation rises sometimes to an extreme when they are brought face to face with the aggregate of public appropriations. The Senator's people are in favor of economy, and earnestly so, but they want the appropriations which they desire for their own State exempted from the general program. The people of my State are in favor of economy, sincerely and earnestly so; but they naturally desire those appropriations designed for the benefit of their community, upon the assumption that they are necessary, to be exempted from the general program; and that, of course, is the universal condition. In effect it so operates as that nothing is exempted. It is just that condition which confronts the majority in the formation of a tariff bill taking in all the schedules, even a Democratic tariff bill for revenue only. Among the strongest advocates of the reduction of duties are those who want their own business exempted from the operation of the general law, and they are sincerely in favor of tariff reduction. It is the impossibility of economizing by piecemeal, by locality, and the consequent inevitable tendency toward the making of omnibus bills framed to include all these things and all these communities which produces extravagance.

When I say that the people are not in favor of economy, I have reference to the practical operation of their economic ideas upon financial legislation. For example, some time ago I received a letter from a constituent very much interested in a bill pending before the other House, and which he wanted me to introduce here, calling for some \$5,000,000 for the construction of a needed piece of railroad. This gentleman called my attention to the fact that the bridging of the gap which this small section of railroad would effectuate would open up the coal deposits—and they are enormous—in the southwestern part of Colorado and the agricultural and mineral possibilities to the southwest and give them direct communication to Los Angeles. He also urged with perfect sincerity that it was an essential element in the scheme of preparedness, since this coal would be needed, in case of a foreign war, for our battle-ships and battle cruisers and submarines, and so forth, upon the Pacific coast.

I answered, calling attention to the enormous demands now being made upon the Treasury, to the fact that it was proposed to increase our Navy and our Army, and consequently increase taxes, and that our people should not only practice but preach and urge upon their representatives the strictest economy. The correspondent replied that that was true, and that he not only desired it but would hold me responsible, as far as he could, for it; "but here is something that must be exempted from the operation of this principle. We need the railroad. It is essential to our community life. It is essential to the great scheme of preparedness, and therefore it is not extravagant."

Mr. President, that incident is not only duplicated but multiplied infinitely and indefinitely before every Congress that has convened in my lifetime, and it will doubtless be repeated until some method of financial legislation not at present visible even upon the distant horizon shall take the place of the loose and slipshod method which has characterized the American Congress during the life of this Nation.

I wish that both parties could recommend and insist upon the adoption of what is called the budget system. It may not be the best but it seems to me to be the only solution of this problem, since, by adopting it, the estimates made by those who ought to know will constitute the maximum of appropriations for every year. We may reduce them, but we can not exceed them. On the other hand, too, those thus charged with the duty of financial legislation will see to it that their estimates and the purposes of the appropriations are strictly public in their character, and that the money devoted to the purposes mentioned in the budget will be so expended, and for the public benefit.

That plan meets with opposition from a great many people who are economists in theory, but who seem to apprehend that it

may interfere with some exigent appropriation in which they may be interested thereafter. I believe it will work out, and I believe it will come when through the increase of taxes—direct taxes, I hope—the additional burden placed upon the backs of the people will cause them to realize that they can not keep their apple and at the same time eat it; and if increases come with a decrease in our present tide of prosperity, then many of the public now clamoring for appropriations will be the loudest in their denunciations of Congress for its extravagance.

I repeat, Mr. President, lest I be misunderstood, that I merely wanted to call the attention, and I think I have called the attention, of the Senate to the fact that in regard to the introduction of bills for appropriations, the sums desired and required and asked for, honors are practically easy on both sides of this Chamber.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to call attention to the fact that the total annual expenditures of the United States Government, large as they may seem, are only five or six times larger than the total annual expenditures of the city of New York; and that the expenditures per capita of the city of New York are about \$40, while those of the Federal Government are about \$10 or \$12.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true; and the Senator might add that the interest-bearing bonded debt of the city of New York is several hundred millions larger than the interest-bearing bonded debt of the Government of the United States. That money was and is being expended in a system of public improvements made necessary by the requirements of an enormous and congested population. It is raised by the issuance of bonds. That tremendous burden is thus very largely postponed and placed upon the shoulders of posterity. There is a day of payment coming for that, Mr. President; and if the sums of money being expended, as the Senator has reminded me, were required to be raised by direct taxation upon the principle of "pay as you go" their enormous total would disappear.

It is always easy to spend money at somebody else's expense. The easiest thing in the world is to have a good time on the money of others; and the tendency of the people of this generation and the preceding one, not only in the United States but everywhere, is to spend all the money they think they need at the expense of posterity, and let our children take care of the burden. We will indulge in luxury and in riotous living. These enormous incumbrances will not mature until long after we are dead and gone, and either enjoying ourselves somewhere else, or the contrary. Let posterity struggle with that problem.

It is upon this principle, Mr. President, that many people propose to pay for this system of preparedness—by issuing bonds, taxing the present generation only for the amount of interest, and, to use a common expression, "passing the buck" to posterity. There will be a day of reckoning some time between the public creditor and the tax-paying debtor. I hope it may never come with disaster as its attendant. There are no signs of it at present; but when we reflect that the expenditures and, consequently, the indebtedness of the cities, counties, municipal districts, school districts, and States is increasing by leaps and bounds, and that when a bond issue matures it is generally paid by the substitution for it of another bond issue, carrying, possibly, some different rate of interest and expiring 50 or 60 years hence—a practice which can not go on forever—and that each succeeding issue adds to the sum total of the aggregate indebtedness of the people, and that our total interest-bearing burden for city, county, State, and national indebtedness runs into the billions, and then reflect that there must be a day of payment, and that the source of payment is taxation upon the productive and consuming energies of the people; there are problems gathering for which we are responsible but which other generations must solve. These are dark and sinister in contemplation, and I fear are potent for trouble to those who will succeed us upon this stage of action.

Mr. President, in connection with these expenditures, of which this bill forms a part, I want for a moment to speak upon the coming tax increase. This bill will pass. I do not think there is any question about that. It is not a party measure. It is going to pass by the votes of Republicans and Democrats, most of them from the States receiving these appropriations, some of them from States not receiving the appropriations. I have no doubt that the flood-control bill, carrying \$45,000,000 or \$50,000,000, which came over yesterday from the House, will also pass; and, of course, when we come to the increase of the Army and the Navy, with the hundreds of millions of additional appropriations that they will carry, not only for this year but

as a continuing expenditure, I want to ask my friends upon the other side if they have considered any of the problems of increasing taxation to meet these enormous sums?

Of course, I am aware that the responsibility for such legislation is here; that it is one of the issues and conditions that power must necessarily assume; and that, whatever the merit or lack of merit in such legislation may be, we will receive treatment accordingly, and particularly from our historic adversaries. Yet it seems to me, Mr. President, that when our friends on the other side participate in the enactment of bills like this they ought to join with us, at least to the extent of considering carefully and giving us the benefit of their wise counsel with regard to methods of securing added revenue.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will state, in response to the query of the Senator, that I have been considering very seriously the sources of revenue and the methods of raising sufficient funds to meet these enlarged expenditures, and, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I will state three sources as to which I have arrived at a conclusion.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator state them.

Mr. SHERMAN. One is to increase the customs duties until about 40 or 45 per cent of our expenditures shall be raised from that source. Another is to readjust the income tax. A third is to enact a proper inheritance tax, with a division of the inheritance tax between the States, in which probate and laws of descent are provided, and the General Government.

Mr. THOMAS. I am more than obliged to the Senator for his suggestions. With regard to the first suggestion that, of course, is one which the policy and practice of the Republican Party ever since it became a dominant factor in administration has pursued, and one to which he very naturally and from their standpoint very properly turns when matters of revenue are considered. We are opposed to it, and without saying anything controversial upon the subject at this time, I think I owe it to the Senator to say that one reason, if not a principal reason, for my objection is, that it involves a method of indirect taxation which I think is a most pernicious principle. It hypnotizes the energies and the activities of the man who pays it in so far as the expenditure of that money is concerned. If a man pays taxes unconsciously he is not particularly concerned about the manner of its expenditure. Not being conscious of the burden, he takes upon himself no worry as to the manner in which the money may be disposed of.

I think that one reason why our State governments are less extravagant than our National Government is due to the fact that they depend for their revenues upon a system of direct taxation. The citizen must walk up to the captain's office and put his hand in his pocket and take out and pay over his money and he knows the effect of it. It is something real, but if he buys a pound of sugar or a yard of calico, or some other dutiable article the indirect import tax is both small and unnoticed. Hence the tendency to extravagance and liberality in appropriations is inevitable when a system of indirect taxation prevails.

I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Illinois with regard to the other two subjects to which he refers, and without going into them very extensively, I also believe in a good, round tax upon munitions of war, or rather upon those who manufacture them, so that the prodigious profits which are always made in those contracts may contribute, and be made to contribute very liberally, to the objects and purposes for which the added expenditures are incurred, and to meet which these extra taxes are required.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will, of course, agree that that would be of a temporary nature, because the war we hope will not continue always.

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President; I do not think it will be of a temporary nature unless the Government goes very largely into the manufacture of such munitions as it needs. The furnishing of war supplies is continuous. If we are to-day threatened with war, and I have my own views about that, and because we are threatened with war or because there may be a possible menace from some direction, we must add to our expenditures by way of preparation to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars now, and more next year; the same cause which induces us to take this new step will require us to continue in that direction. Of course, if there were a time when these things would cease to be demanded the tax would very naturally be eliminated; but so long as there be institutions making profit upon our need for preparation, just so long should

the Government lay its strong hand upon their resources and require them to contribute, and contribute liberally, to the meeting of the bill.

Mr. President, let me now turn for a few moments to the bill under consideration. I have stated that I had no intention to refer to any specific items in it—that would be invidious—nor, indeed, to any of the States that are interested in the sense that these items to a greater or less degree are to be expended in them. I shall not allude to them nor to the Territory; but, speaking collectively, the bill provides 286 specific appropriations for the improvement of rivers and of harbors in 29 States and 4 Territories of the Union. Its benefits are to be distributed over these various Commonwealths in a greater or less degree of impartiality and reaching from one ocean to the other. It carries a total as amended here of \$40,889,935, together with authorizations of continuing contracts amounting to a sum in excess of \$2,000,000 more, or a grand total of \$42,934,885.

The bill is entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes." To my mind, it is largely for other purposes.

I think, Mr. President, that it is no more than due to those framing this bill to say that it is probably cast as economically as it was possible under the circumstances and at the same time secure the passing of any bill at all. It should also be said that there is nothing new in this method of legislation, the grouping together of items from different parts of the Union into one bill and through that operation bringing to its support as an entirety votes which otherwise could not be obtainable at all.

There is nothing new, Mr. President, in this legislation, even as regards the American people, because I have no doubt that the practice obtained elsewhere before it found lodgment here. But whether that be true or not, it is the natural, inevitable, and unavoidable consequence of our methods of legislation, and particularly our methods of financial legislation. The practice has had various appellations in various parts of the country, logrolling being one of them. The public, for reasons satisfactory to them or for no reason at all perhaps, have fixed upon one designation for bills of this character and then wrongfully confined it to only two or three of the supply bills which pass Congress at every session. They are known as pork-barrel bills or pork bills. This may and doubtless does carry a term of reproach with it. That reproach, however, should be cast on each and every supply bill.

I have said such legislation is unavoidable, and that it always will be unavoidable until our methods of financial legislation are radically changed. Hence nothing should in any sense reflect discredit upon the authors of this measure, either because of the public estimate of its character or because of its inherent structure, since the method did not originate with them; and certainly nothing that I say by way of criticism is designed to carry any sort of personal tone or note with it.

But, of course, Mr. President, unless some effort is made either to circumscribe or to terminate this method of procedure it will naturally and necessarily continue, and continue in aggravated form. Indeed, as I have just stated, it is not peculiar to this bill. I do not know of a single appropriation bill of any consequence to which the reproach does not also apply. Take the Agricultural appropriation bill, the Indian appropriation bill, the Post Office appropriation bill, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill—any and all of them—they are covered, and the practice is increasing of covering them, with so-called riders carrying appropriations for this, that, and the other object or purpose quite as reprehensible and becoming quite as common as the items in what is generally known as an omnibus bill. If one be "pork," so is the other.

There is another reason for it, which consists in the fact that in national legislation the title of a bill has nothing to do with its subject matter, or at least if there be any relation between the two it is sometimes extremely remote. I think that every State in the Union, or nearly every one, by its constitution requires that all bills except general appropriation bills shall be confined to one subject only, and which subject shall be clearly stated in the title of the bill.

The fathers who framed our Constitution did so at a time when the evils of legislation consequent upon the power to include all subjects or any subjects in bills regardless of the title were not as manifest as they have since become.

Personally I believe that no greater service could be done to the people of the United States than by giving them an opportunity to amend their Constitution by expressly limiting all bills except general appropriation bills to one subject, and requiring that subject to be stated clearly and distinctly in the title. That would make a great many of these evils of Federal

legislation absolutely impossible. Every bill that passes this body and carrying appropriations convinces me more and more of the prime need of resorting to the budget system in one direction and of amending the Constitution with regard to our legislative procedure in the other.

I think it is safe to say, Mr. President, that a very large proportion of the items in this bill would be voted down if they could be submitted to a separate vote. I believe there are many items in this bill carrying appropriations in some of the States of the Union which would not command the support of the Senators from that State if a separate vote upon those items could be secured. But because other appropriations are desired, because still other appropriations are absolutely essential, and because in order to get them we are obliged to attach those which are neither essential, necessary, or just, they find their way into the Treasury in conjunction with the beneficial items.

Now, that is wrong. No man can defend it. No man tries to defend it. Yet we practice it, all of us, the Speaker not excepted, and we practice it because it has crystallized into a custom which claims to be respectable through precedent and the lapse of years. But there is no reason, Mr. President, why, because of that fact, essential changes should not or could not be made.

Now, this bill is somewhat like the situation before the dawn of creation. It is chaotic; there is nothing systematic about it, and it is wasteful, extravagantly so, with regard to many of its items, since their expenditure in no sense improves navigation or even has a tendency to improve it. That is self-evident, it seems to me, when we consider that these appropriations are made with painful and unflinching regularity every time a bill of this kind comes up for consideration, and backed by the same arguments. Indeed, they are strengthened, not only by the same argument but by the fact that each recurring appropriation establishes another precedent for its renewal as the occasion may permit.

If these items were correlated, if they were a part of some intelligent or established system with an ultimate design of general improvement or benefit, it would be extremely questionable, to my mind, if we would then be justified in making the appropriations for them. But they are not. They have no more relation to each other than the Congress of the United States has to the Mexican zodiac. Some are along the Atlantic seaboard, some in the Mississippi Valley, some away out on the Pacific coast, some on the Gulf of Mexico. I am speaking particularly of those appropriations that are made to improve rivers, some actual and others rivers by courtesy, not so much of those to improve harbors, for they need not be and seldom are connected up in any way, although a system of financial legislation regarding them might well be systematized, and thoroughly systematized, so that the expenditures would be beneficial, not in part but as an entirety.

Now, Mr. President, if this bill and the purposes it is to subserve are desirable and the bill were drawn upon intelligent and systematic lines, the fact would be established better by pointing to the benefits resulting from preceding legislation of a similar character than in any other way. In other words, if by this method of legislation we are developing a system of river and harbor improvements to the benefit of our interstate commerce as well as our local traffic the facts would be abundantly shown, irrefragably shown, by the operation of similar expenditures during the 25 or 30 years that have elapsed immediately prior to the commencement of this Congress. Yet what do we find? Improvement, increased expansion of our river traffic? The development of commerce along these watery highways and their adjustment to or their competition with land transportation? Has anyone contended or claimed that for the some eight hundred million and odd dollars expended upon this scheme or system we have either an industrial condition or a traffic system or both commensurate with these enormous expenditures? Not at all.

Mr. President, the only approach to it, if I correctly comprehend the arguments to which I have listened upon the subject for the last two or three years, is that by the improvement of our rivers through national expenditure the railways of the country are unable to fix traffic rates as high as would otherwise be the case, and that the consequent indirect benefit is so great as to justify not only these but larger appropriations.

The distinguished Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair] the other day called attention to the beneficial effects of rivers and harbors improvement in his State upon the rates charged for service upon some of its waters, and I have no doubt that this local benefit in the particular instances exists; nor have I any doubt that in such instances and in others of an isolated character and of a simi-

lar character the railway rates have accommodated themselves to this water competition.

But, Mr. President, in every instance whatever loss has been thus inflicted by river and harbor bills upon the railways in your State and in other States similarly situated has found compensation in the increase of rates to a far greater degree in those other sections of the country not similarly blessed with water competition either actual or potential.

In my State, which is the stepdaughter of the Republic in railway estimation, where even potential water competition does not exist, the losses to the railways of New Jersey and of other States where water competition exists are more than made up by the schedules upon traffic in Colorado and the other mountain States, and perhaps some of the other States as well.

We have had many discussions in Colorado at times of depressed financial and industrial conditions regarding their causes and how they could be overcome. We have attributed hard times and lack of prosperity to many things, and doubtless rightfully to some degree. But inevitably, Mr. President, we reach one conclusion, one goal, Democrats, Republicans, Progressives, black, white, Jew, and Gentile, which is the discrimination in rates upon traffic, putting us at a disadvantage with competitors elsewhere.

We have a railroad running from the city of Denver to the harbor of Galveston, downhill all the way. Yet the freight rates upon that road are so cunningly devised that it costs more to send freight from Denver down to the sea than it does to haul it up to Galveston. It costs us 35 cents a hundred more to send Colorado sugar to San Francisco than it does to bring California sugar to Colorado.

So, Mr. President, I might go on enumerating specific rates with regard to many articles. The freight rate upon many articles from the Pacific coast to Denver is neither more nor less than the freight rate upon them from the Pacific coast to New York or Boston. Per contra, the freight rate from New York and Boston to the Pacific coast is much greater than the freight rate, generally speaking, from New York and other Atlantic common points to Denver and to Salt Lake City.

These are instances or illustrations of the manner in which local differences and competition resulting in decreases of rates is compensated for, and if it is true—I hope it is, and I have great respect for the assurances of those who so declare—that the general effect of these huge expenditures in river and harbor improvements is to lower local rates that otherwise would have to be paid for competing land transportation, then I concede some local benefit resulting from these expenditures. But if it be true generally, I ask why should we continue our Interstate Commerce Commission? Why should we continue the expense of local commissions—and nearly every State in the Union has them now—for the regulation of these public utilities and to restrain them from the imposition of extortionate rates, if we can accomplish the desired results so easily by the expenditure every year of only forty or fifty million dollars of public money in the improvement of rivers and harbors?

I do not think we derive any general benefit, Mr. President, from these expenditures. I notice that the authority and jurisdiction of the Federal Interstate Commerce Commission, which in some respects has failed so far to accomplish the purposes for which it was created, and which does not cost more than three or four million dollars a year, speaking very roughly, of course—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. Yet the Interstate Commerce Commission has done more to relieve the people from the evils of discrimination in transportation both as to communities and as to individuals than all the river and harbor bills that have been enacted into law since the beginning of this Republic or that may be enacted in the future. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does not the Senator know that the railroads do not make the rates in cases where they charge more for a short haul than for a long haul? Such rates are permissive to them. They must be in each case permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Is the Senator familiar with the process of reasoning by which the Interstate Commerce Commission reaches the conclusion that that is now a just way to fix rates?

Mr. THOMAS. I am familiar with it, Mr. President, as far as a man can be familiar with an intricate process of speculative reasoning. The reasons given have never appealed to me very strongly, but, generally speaking, the basis of the regulation to which the Senator refers is due to competing

railroads of different length between the same points or to transcontinental railroads suffering under the same differences with regard to mileage and supposedly confronted with water competition.

Of course, traffic has something to do with it. I have always believed that the railroad which can haul cheapest should be permitted to do so, notwithstanding the fact that railroads of greater mileage competing with it are obliged to charge considerably more, and for this reason, that the rates on the business which is local to each one of the lines make up the difference in every instance, or at least the effort is made to so fix such rates as to give the compensation in almost every instance where the short and long haul rate was authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. In order that the Senator may understand more distinctly the phase of the question to which I desired to direct his attention, I will call attention to a statement of a case given by the senior Senator from Utah. He says that the freight on the supply of steel out of which a building in Salt Lake City was constructed cost, from Pittsburgh to point of delivery, \$100,000 more than the freight on the steel for an identically similar building constructed at Seattle cost.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. How does the Senator explain that? I should have said that the shipment to Seattle passed through Salt Lake City en route to Seattle.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad the Senator made the second interruption. That practice is defended or permitted upon the theory that water competition between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts makes it necessary, if I understand correctly; in other words, what might be called potential water competition prevails on the coast, which is therefore favored with the lower rate. In fact, I once listened to an argument before the Interstate Commerce Commission a good many years ago, in which I participated to some degree, where that circumstance was iterated and reiterated by the attorneys for the railway companies. That is the reason also given in a number of the decisions which I can not recall by name, though I remember the Spokane case quite distinctly. In so far as the cities upon the two extremes of the continent are concerned, there is no question about the fact of a possible or potential water competition which, if no other compensating elements entered, might justify that situation; but, Mr. President, until recently, at any rate, this water competition was in fact wholly supposititious. I concede that it was potential, but actually it was imaginary, because the railways owned or controlled the lines of steamships which alone could create the competition.

I recall that a number of years ago the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., which was then practically in control of the Pacific Mail Line of steamships, entered into a contract with it whereby the road agreed to pay, and did pay, the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., in consideration of its refusal to haul any freight, or practically to haul no freight at all, more money than it could possibly earn if its vessels made their voyages with full cargoes each way; in other words, it received more money from the treasury of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. for doing nothing and allowing its vessels to practically lie idle and rot away in the harbors than it could have made in competition with their vessels loaded to the decks on every voyage; and yet the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., in the face of that condition, successfully contended for its transcontinental rate in conjunction with the other transcontinental railroads, on the ground that the potential competition threatened by the ability of capital to establish new and independent lines of steamships between the two oceans, and which probably would be established if this long haul were not to be made or permitted at prices lower than some of the short hauls. The argument prevailed, and in consequence of it the desired rulings were made.

But, now, Mr. President, how do the railways operate under the ruling? How have they operated until interfered with, not by river and harbor bills—because they were being enacted at that time, just as they were before and have been since—but by the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission? It was my fortune to represent a number of large interests in Goldfield, Nev.—which, roundly speaking, is about 500 miles from San Francisco—in the early days of the development of that camp, when it needed machinery and building material, in fact, everything that a community needs for existence in these modern days. They got most of it from San Francisco, though a great deal of it was obtained from the East. The rates of the Southern Pacific Railroad upon all traffic from the Pacific coast to Goldfield were virtually the same as the rates upon traffic

from the East to Goldfield, which were calculated, first, upon the basis of the through route to the coast plus the local rate back to the city of Goldfield, and the additional freight charge thus imposed upon the consumers in Goldfield, Nev., in those days was equal to the freight rates from New York to South Africa by way of San Francisco. That is but one instance.

I do not know of any exception to the rule, that interior towns, large and small, and away from the coast, were always required, notwithstanding the rate to the coast, to pay that rate plus the local rate back to the point of delivery, although, of course, the route of the freight terminated at the point of delivery, and did not go to the coast at all.

If this bill could regulate such conditions as that, I would not say a word against it; I think it would be worth to the people of this country, to the consumers and producers, everything that it calls for; but I am not convinced, Mr. President, that it does it or that it even tends to do it.

I might, in further answer to the query of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], say that the potential water competition producing these reduced rates from coast to coast is ocean competition, which needs no river and harbor improvement. It may need some harbor repairs, of course, at the receiving and delivering points, but it needs none of this internal improvement; and the great bulk of the appropriations of this bill is for improvements or for purposes having no relation whatever to the underlying reasons for the long and the short haul.

Mr. President, if the items of this bill were correlated or could be correlated, it would at least escape the criticism of lack of systematic structure; but that is not the case. The appropriation for Sunflower River in one State is entirely independent of the appropriation for Shallow Bag Creek in another State; the appropriation for a small stream in the State of Washington has nothing whatever to do with a similar appropriation for a small stream in the State of Kentucky. In none of them, Mr. President, is there any correlation between the improvement itself and the other systems of transportation which doubtless exist in that vicinity.

I thoroughly believe—I may be mistaken, but I am convinced—that until the time comes, if it ever does come, when the railway or land transportation of this country is correlated or connected with our proposed water system of transportation there will be no water traffic at all to speak of. It is a remarkable fact that traffic upon our rivers decreases as the appropriation for their improvement increases. They seem to be in inverse proportion to each other. When these bills reach an appropriation of \$150,000,000 there will not be a ton of traffic in this country transported by water unless the present relation between traffic and expenditure shall assume a different form and a different proportion.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] the other day called attention to the wonderful system of improvements of water courses and harbors in Germany and declared that we should emulate the example of that most efficient people in the world, be guided by their experience, and therefore reach the same desirable results. To that I cordially subscribe in so far as the material conditions of Germany are concerned and without any reference to its political affairs or its form of government. There is no question, Mr. President, but that that great people are, in the development of their commerce, their industry, their manufactures, their resources, and all that contributes to the material welfare and comfort and civilization of a people, the most wonderful and efficient nation in the world. During the last 40 years, which is almost the life of the German Empire, it has developed a system of industry, of commerce, a system of growth and of development, a system of industry in all its varied branches, including the education of its youth, the development of its cities, the government of its municipalities, that has no equal anywhere in the world, and to which all nations might well aspire; and I venture the prediction that when this war is ended, even should it end with the defeat of the German Empire, that nation will be the first of the great nations involved to recover its poise, to get upon its feet, and to set about in a systematic way the reconstruction of its industries, its trade, its political and commercial status.

That wonderful people, Mr. President, realized by intuition, as it were, that river and harbor improvement was worthless unless it could be coordinated with the system of transportation by land. Not alone for that reason, because this is a military people, and is actuated in the last analysis by military reasons and demands, for practically every step that it has taken in any other direction has had the military purpose in view, but, partly for that reason, one of the first steps taken by the newly created German Empire was the nationalization of its

system of railroads; and with the exception of a few lines in some of the smaller States, it is, and for years has been, the owner of all the railroads in its dominions. A recent work by Frederic C. Howe, entitled "Socialized Germany," one of the most remarkable and, to me, one of the most interesting books I ever read, which was written just before, but published just immediately after, the outbreak of the European war, gives some interesting information upon this subject. I read from page 104 of this work and from chapter 7, which is entitled "The State-owned railways," a short extract, as follows:

"German railroads," says an English observer, "have largely contributed to the prosperity of German industry; the British railways have largely contributed to the decay of British industries. In Germany trade policy is made by trade; in Great Britain it is made by the railroads, which, without consulting the trade, prescribe its course, stimulating it here and stifling it there."

If that were written of this country it could not be a truer statement of our own situation; and I may remark here, by way of digression, that there is no interrelation between the British railroads and the British waterways, either natural or artificial, and consequently no great amount of water traffic, comparatively speaking—and by "comparatively speaking" I mean by way of comparison with Germany; and Britain in this regard is more in our than in Germany's situation.

The next chapter in this work refers to canals, waterways, and free ports, and to my mind is the most interesting chapter in the entire work, except that upon education. I read from page 121, as follows:

Waterway development, as a means of cheapening freights and the development of inland centers, has gone hand in hand with the extension of the railways, and in recent years the waterways have been receiving the greatest attention. This is remarkable, in view of the immense profits which the State receives from the operation of the railways, which profits have undoubtedly been materially reduced by water competition.

The program of waterway development has been thought out for many years to come and on a most elaborate scale. It includes the linking up of all the great ports of ocean entry with the rivers and inland centers by ship canals and river systems, capable of carrying very heavy traffic. In addition, splendid harbors have been built along the Rhine and on the North and Baltic Seas, with free ports at Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. A network of canals is to unite the Rhine, the Danube, the Oder, the Weser, and the Meuse, of sufficient dimensions to carry large craft. Already the register of canal boats has been raised from 150 to 600 tons. Transportation by canals and rivers is closely integrated with the railways through splendidly equipped terminals, which facilitates the easy transshipment of freight from one to the other, while the larger towns on the rivers and ocean harbors have built the most completely equipped docks and warehouses for the development of trade and industry.

Is there any spot in this favored country, Mr. President, where "the railways, through splendidly equipped terminals," facilitate the easy transshipment of freight from themselves to the waterways or to the harbors? If so, it is because the railways own the wharfage facilities in that spot, and thereby control those lines of steamships and sailing vessels with which they interchange traffic.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] called the attention of the Senate the other day to the almost universal railroad ownership everywhere of the river fronts and water and harbor fronts where the great railway systems center to receive and discharge their freight—owned for the purpose of facilitating water navigation and water traffic? No; but for the purpose of stifling it or of controlling it, and never for the purpose of utilizing it, except when it is to the advantage of the railroads.

This author then gives the marvelous growth of the water traffic under the German system, and proceeds, on page 122:

A comprehensive imperial waterway program was authorized in 1905. It includes two great undertakings—one, the Rhine-Weser project, for a canal to connect the former river with the Dortmund-Ems Canal, from the latter to the Weser, the enlargement of other canals, and the canalization of the River Lippe, the estimated cost of which was \$62,687,500.

I ask leave, Mr. President, to insert, without reading, page 124 and the first two lines of page 125.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

The most notable features in the act of 1905, authorizing the Rhine-Weser and Oder projects, are the wide powers of expropriation of adjoining land reserved to the Government and the provision for a State monopoly of the towing service on the Rhine-Weser Canal and its branches.

In view of the improvements in transit facilities on the main rivers (Rhine, Oder, Weser) and some of their tributaries, the Agrarian Party, which has opposed waterway development because of fear of agricultural competition, insisted that dues be paid "on rivers regulated in the interest of navigation." Prussia promised this amendment without consulting the other States, although it involved an alteration in the constitution, which expressly prohibits dues on the natural waterways of the country. But the constitution was changed and the other States were induced to acquiesce—Bavaria, for example—by the promised canalization of the Main. The plans include a river board for each river, upon which all the principal interests concerned should be represented, and the dues to be charged were to be uniform on all the rivers. The Government claims the purpose of the dues is not to earn surpluses for the State, but to cover actual costs by an "inconsiderable addition to freightage rates."

In the construction of these great canal projects "rivers are crossed, ascents and descents of hundreds of feet are made with facility, and ships lifted and lowered bodily in troughs instead of by the old and slow method of locks."

Mr. THOMAS. On page 125 the author continues:

So comprehensive is the waterway development that goods can be sent from the mouth of the Rhine direct into Switzerland and the south of France in one direction and to Württemberg, Bavaria, and Austria in another. Merchandise bought in Hamburg can be dispatched by river and canal every yard of the way from that port to Berlin, or even to Silesia in the extreme south of Prussia. The canals have made Berlin, 400 miles from the sea, a great port, second only to the North Sea ports, and three cities on the Rhine.

Of course it will be borne in mind, Mr. President, that railway transportation between these points exists as well as, the line of canals referred to, and that both are prosperous because of their cooperation and not because of any competition that is between them or that can exist between them.

On page 126 the author says:

The waterways are used for the handling of heavy bulk freight, such as coal, iron ore, lumber, grain, and the heavier articles of commerce, whose immediate delivery is not important. On these commodities very low rates are charged. And this is one reason why the railway freight rates in Germany are higher than in this country. For the waterways carry one-sixth as much freight as do the railways. Were the heavy bulk freight, which goes by water, subtracted from the freight by rail in America and a comparison made of similar commodities, it might be found that freight rates by commodities were as low in Germany as they are in America.

The canals and navigable rivers are operated in connection with the railways, which are further operated in connection with the docks and harbors, in which every provision is made for the cheap and easy transshipment of freight from one to the other. There is no conflict between water and rail transportation; no conflict between the public and private owners over the possession of the water front. All of these agencies are operated together as a unit for the promotion of the domestic and foreign trade of the Empire. They are all part of a co-ordinated whole.

It is unnecessary, Mr. President, to quote further from this book upon that subject.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. I have read enough to show the identification, complete and absolute, of the land transportation system with the water transportation system of the German Empire, and that this is the absolute and indispensable prerequisite to any development of water traffic in a country that has both classes of transportation. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I am very glad indeed that the Senator has read the illuminating extracts from the work of Mr. Howe, entitled "Socialized Germany." I think they corroborate exactly what I said several days ago to the effect that the Germans, who are as wise a people as exist in the world, have found it proper and beneficial to improve their waterways and use them as very great carriers of commerce—

Mr. THOMAS. They certainly do.

Mr. RANSDELL. And use them as a most important part of their transportation system. That, I believe, is the conclusion at which the Senator from Colorado arrives.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; unquestionably.

Mr. RANSDELL. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a state of facts on one of our great waterway systems in this country which I think are almost identical with those in Germany. I refer to the Great Lakes. Until within the past year, if I mistake not, the railroads and the boats on the Great Lakes did cooperate just as thoroughly as they cooperate in Germany. The railroads owned the boats and carried decidedly the greater part of the commerce of the Great Lakes in their own boats; and that commerce last year was about 71,000,000 tons, carried at .071 of one mill per ton per mile, while the average charge for rail transportation of the country was 7.3 mills. So, on our Great Lake system, by cooperation between the rail and water carriers, I think there have been as good results accomplished as have been accomplished in Germany.

Now, I want to ask the Senator this question: Would it not be possible for us to devise some system by which we might get the same kind of cooperation between rail and river transportation in this country as the Germans have on all of their waterways and which has heretofore existed in this country between rail and water carriers on the Great Lakes? If the Senator can suggest such a method, I should be delighted to cooperate with him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can suggest one method, and, I think, the only possible one, and that is the German method—ownership by the Government of the system of land transportation and its consequent compulsory cooperation with water traffic on the waterways.

I do not think that the Senator's reference to traffic upon the Great Lakes is an apposite one. The Great Lakes of the country are more analogous to the ocean than they are to river and harbor systems. Long before the railroad companies monopolized the water traffic of the Lakes that traffic

was enormous, and was carried on by competitive lines, nearly all of which, when properly managed, made great profit. The traffic on the Lakes is more like the traffic from New York and other Atlantic ports to Liverpool and other European ports than it is to the subject matter of this bill.

Mr. President, I think in this connection that it is proper to assume—and I think it can be assumed safely—that if the railroads owned the boats that ply upon our rivers and along our coast line where railroad competition is possible, instead of developing our river traffic and our coastwise traffic it would be strangled, to a degree, and the railroads would do all of the business. That is human nature; that is the result of competition where one of the competing parties has such an enormous advantage; in other words, the private ownership of railroads is wholly incompatible with the use of our navigable streams for purposes of commerce. Railroads in private ownership will strangle water-borne commerce; they will throttle it; they will kill it, as they have killed it wherever it has been possible to do so. On the other hand, by placing the railroads where they were at the dawn of the development of the system, and where they always should have remained—in the hands of the people, as public institutions, subserving a great public purpose, operated for the public benefit—I do not believe we would have had such unsystematic and crude and wasteful methods of legislation regarding the rivers that have characterized such legislation for the last 25 or 30 years.

Mr. President, I am unable to perceive that this method of spending money for the improvement of rivers either benefits commerce or creates it, on the one hand, or that, on the other, it protects and preserves the rivers and the people living near them from the results of floods. Of course, there are exceptions to that statement. The vast sums of money spent upon the Mississippi River and some of the other great water arteries of the country are expenditures which have been called for by the necessities of the country, and particularly of those localities. They have been devoted to the laudable purpose of protecting life and property, but even they, Mr. President, have been most unsystematic and therefore most unsatisfactory. Money for the improvement of rivers either for purposes of navigation or for purposes of protection must necessarily be expended properly, systematically, and intelligently or it can not subserve the purposes of the appropriation. It is practically impossible.

My friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has on several occasions introduced a measure designed to bring about a systematic and unified treatment of this whole problem. Although the amount of money which he wants for that purpose may be necessary, its amount is so startling to an average mind like mine, which has not yet become accustomed to dealing in millions, the system itself is an intelligent and comprehensible one. He would begin at the source of the streams and, by operating, first, upon the tributaries, conserving the waters, and regulating their flow, not only preserve their natural and normal depth for the purposes of navigation but at the same time equalize that depth through the distribution of waters from these reservoirs during the dry seasons of the year; and, in addition, he would utilize these waters for industrial purposes and minimize the dangers and the destructive consequences of the ever-recurring floods that seem to come with greater frequency as the years go by.

Mr. President, that bill has for its recommendation a system, a plan of development, practically universal in its application, and necessarily leading to the solution of this problem, and I believe it is the only way in which it can be solved. If it were left to me, I would never expend a dollar for the improvement of the rivers of this country for purposes of navigation so long as the railways remain wholly in private hands. I would spend every dollar necessary for the protection of life and property along these streams for the regulation, if not for the prevention, of the flood flow and for the general purposes of navigation consequent upon an equalized distribution of water, checking it at the high periods and allowing it to flow liberally at periods of drought and when the streams are otherwise too low for navigation.

I do not know whether the Senator from Nevada will ever get a substantial consideration of his bill or not. He certainly has the merit of persistence, and that is a most excellent one, particularly in the Senate of the United States, if one would accomplish anything. I am satisfied that if he lives as long as I hope he will he will impress his ideas with regard to this method of river control and improvement, not only upon the country but upon a majority of this body, because, among other things, it will do away, in my judgment, with the necessity, real or assumed, of appropriations such as that I am now considering.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Perhaps the Senator has touched upon this subject and given the answer, but, if he has, I did not hear it.

The Senator says he would not spend another dollar on the rivers of the country as long as the railroads are in private ownership.

Mr. THOMAS. For purposes of trade and water traffic.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; for deepening their channels, and so forth, and making them navigable.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; for the purpose of promoting commerce.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, suppose the Government owned the railroads. Would the Senator then spend money on the rivers?

Mr. THOMAS. Unquestionably.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator had been here when I quoted—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will not ask the Senator to repeat it if he has covered that.

Mr. THOMAS. I quoted a number of extracts upon that subject from Mr. Frederick C. Howe's recent work upon "Socialized Germany," the purpose of which was to show that without the cooperation of land and water transportation the latter was impossible in these days; that you could not develop it, no matter what amount of money might be expended for the purpose, except in limited degree, of course.

Germany nationalized her railroad system very shortly after the Empire was consolidated. She has since then carried on a system of river improvement, canal building, and harbor improvement in conjunction with her ownership of the railroads which she has required to build terminal facilities for the interchange of traffic between the rivers and themselves. She has fixed rates for the railways with regard to what might be called bulk freight, the coarser commodities, that are practically prohibitive, thus forcing that class of traffic upon the rivers; and by her interrelated system of water commerce and of railway commerce she has made both very effective, the railroads paying enormous profit to the Government, and the traffic of the rivers increasing constantly, and bringing many inland cities to the coast by water connection.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield; yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator has evidently given a great deal of very intelligent thought and investigation to this subject; and I wish to ask him, just at this point, if it is not possible to bring about that cooperation of which he speaks by intelligent, comprehensive supervision by the exercise of powers which inherently belong to the National and the State Governments. It strikes me that cooperation and coordination might be effected in that way; that is, I am sure that we could more nearly approximate it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, so far as cooperation between the State and the Nation upon any given subject or enterprise is concerned, I think the tendency constantly is for the States to shift the financial burden more and more upon the National Treasury.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is not that largely due to the fact that the question has not received that exhaustive consideration and study which the importance of it demands? Whenever the people of America discover the advantages which the Senator has referred to as being enjoyed by the people of Germany, it seems to me that it is perfectly natural that they should protect their own interests and bring about this very thing, if the waterways are perfected as it is the desire of all Americans to accomplish.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not we could take the German industrial system without taking the German political system. That is a ponderous, serious, and far-reaching problem—whether the autocracy of the Empire is not the cause, and the necessary cause, of that other system of commercial government and expansion to which we have just referred I am unable to say. I confess that if we could not get the system and develop it effectually except by taking the autocracy of Germany, I should prefer our present system, loose and uncoordinated and unsystematic as it is.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly that would not be more objectionable to the Senator than Government ownership.

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to say that I believe that the industrial system of Germany, especially in so far as transportation is concerned, is a solvable problem on land or by sea by adopting the most efficient elements of the German system, and

that we can accomplish it without submitting ourselves to its political methods and political forms of government.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. THOMAS. But I do not believe it can be done by cooperation between the States and the Nation, nor by any system short of Government ownership; and I have not yet committed myself entirely to that idea, although I confess that as regulation seems to be only partially efficient, I frequently think that it will be a dernier resort of this Nation to take over its great lines of transportation. If I were as devoted to the cause of preparedness as some of my distinguished friends are, I would insist upon doing it now, because military preparation in the modern sense is inseparable from military control of all lines of transportation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, he will find that the most active and enthusiastic advocates of preparedness will be the first to raise their voices against Government ownership of railroads or extreme Government regulation of railroads.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, unquestionably, with some few exceptions.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was very glad to hear the commendatory words of the Senator regarding the measure that I have been urging for so long, and I welcome the clear and incisive expression he has made upon this subject. It seems to me most convincing. I wish, however, to call the Senator's attention to the consideration that the case is hardly as hopeless as he imagines.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I am not so optimistic as my good friend from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course I understand that, and I want to make the Senator more optimistic. The Senator seems to have the view that whilst the regulation of these rivers and the incurring of a very considerable expense therein can be justified by reason of the great public benefit that will come from the mitigation of floods and from the beneficial uses to which the water can be put other than for purposes of navigation, navigation itself can not be a success unless the entire transportation system, both by water and by rail, is in the hands of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, navigation may be a success, if the Senator will permit me, but the development of our traffic by water routes is inconsistent with private control of our lines of land transportation. That was the idea which I sought to convey.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I feel that we have never yet tested our powers regarding coordination between rail and water transportation; that the Nation has never yet exercised its powers in that direction; that the Nation has not as yet perfected a single waterway in the country as an instrumentality of commerce, involving, as that perfection must, not only the maintenance of a good channel and a steady flow but terminal facilities, transfer facilities, and the control of the relations between rail and water carriers in such a way as to prevent the rail carriers from sandbagging the water carriers and driving them out of business. We have never yet sought to exercise those powers. We have hardly attempted it. The attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission has not been directed to it. There is no use in directing the attention of the country to that question until we have made the waterway as nearly perfect as an instrumentality for transportation as the railway itself is.

They are developing to-day carriers taking the place of the old canal boats that will carry from 1,000 to 2,000 tons; and on the Rhine you will see such carriers, 8 or 10 in number, moving along, propelled or directed by a small tugboat. A boat that will carry 1,000 tons will carry as much freight as a train of 20 cars of 50 tons capacity each.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thought I was yielding for a question. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I am pretty nearly through.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wanted to add a little to the abundant information which the Senator has given to the Senate. My purpose was not to ask a question, but to add a little, in a supplementary way, to what the Senator was saying.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if he will tell the Senate how large an amount of money is carried in the bill that he has commended so highly to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Nevada can answer that question better than I. I think it carries about six hundred millions.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is that all? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. In 10 years; only \$60,000,000 a year.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a trifle.

Mr. NEWLANDS. A trifle compared with the five or six hundred millions—possibly a little less—that you propose to expend in military preparedness in a single year.

Mr. NORRIS. When the Senator says "you propose," does he refer to me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, that Congress proposes to expend.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Nevada is extremely fortunate on this occasion in being a Democrat. Otherwise, instead of being commended for the great plan that this bill outlines, he would have been held up as one who was trying to rob the Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator from Nebraska so feels, and is so sensitive about my inclusion of his name in the list which I disclosed, he can escape all that criticism, if he is correct, by coming over on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. I do feel very deeply the criticism, but God knows the remedy is so much worse that I prefer to stand it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator feels very deeply the criticism—very sorry, indeed. He has never tried the remedy, however, and he does not know, therefore, whether it is good or bad.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator has stated that if the price of having efficiency of coordination and operation of the rail and water systems of the country to the extent which Germany has attained were the adoption of the German autocratic form of government, he would prefer to take his chances with the existing situation, or with such as may be worked out, rather than to accept that.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I would rather be free than prosperous.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In saying that I think the Senator has touched upon one of the principal reasons that differentiates our problem from that in autocratic governments; and I was going to ask, if the Senator wants me to put it in the form of a question—

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I do not insist upon that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was going to ask the Senator if he did not think the two systems were entirely different in this respect: That in an autocratic government, where the activities of the people are directed by the government to such an extent as they are in Germany, a great problem like rail and water transportation over a country of great size necessitates, to have it successful, a continuous policy, whereas in a free Republic like this, where the parties are changing from year to year, and their policies are changing, it is very questionable if the Government could operate such a system?

Mr. THOMAS. I think I stated that it was a serious problem in my mind whether we could take the beneficial parts of the German system without taking those that were repulsive to the average American.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And if we do not get the beneficial parts, whatever we did in that line for a year or two might be utterly wasted when the policy of the Government changed.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; it might be. I think, however, that it is possible—I hope it is—to differentiate between the desirable parts and the undesirable parts of the system, if this question can not be solved in any other way.

Now, a word with regard to the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], to which I referred. I stated, or intended to state when I referred to it and commended it, that, to my mind, it was a systematic and intelligent solution of what may be called the water question, and that we would have to resort to that system or to some other system, substituting it for such measures as this bill and the flood-control bill and those other bills which are designed in a haphazard sort of way to improve here, there, and yonder, if we ever got our rivers as a system either navigable or safe; that is to say, safe from floods and from the destructive consequences of these huge masses of water that so frequently devastate these regions. I am not in favor of adopting it now. I would be willing to chance it—and when I say "chance it" I have no reference to the terms of the bill, but to the condition of our Treasury—if we could begin such a system by substituting it for that which I am discussing and for other similar measures.

Mr. President, I have talked upon this subject longer than I intended, and longer than I assured my distinguished and genial friend from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] that I would probably occupy. There are one or two other features of the discussion to which I might refer, but I shall content myself by refraining from it. I can not, Mr. President, vote for this bill, notwithstanding its many important and highly essential features.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he intends to proceed further with the bill to-night or what his purpose is?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Some days since I moved an executive session, and provoked some controversy privately. I thought I would not venture on that any more. Unless somebody else intends to move one, I intend to ask the Senate to take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator wishes to do that now, does he?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes. It is useless to take up any item of the bill at this time.

I desire to say, however, that from this time forward I am going to put the responsibility of delaying this bill upon those who unnecessarily debate it. I am going to test the question as to whether or not the Senate is willing to enforce its existing rules when I shall hereafter object to these so-called interruptions of Senators who are addressing the Senate.

My observation of 10 years convinces me that these interruptions prolong debate and do not elucidate the question to which they are addressed. They are an abuse of the right of debate that I am satisfied Senators themselves would be glad to be rid of if they had the opportunity without appearing to be discourteous to others.

I shall therefore ask that a somewhat more businesslike and systematic method of discussing the bill shall be adhered to from this time forward, not with any view at all of putting limitations upon the right of debate, because that exists under the rules, and as long as it exists it must be recognized and respected; but there are a great many abuses that have imperceptibly ingrafted themselves upon it that I think may be abandoned for the present time.

We are now entering upon the tenth day of the consideration of this bill, and we have considered only two or three of the proposed amendments. I feel satisfied that the Senate does not intend to deliberately sit here and waste its time; but if that is its policy, I, as a Member of it, have no ability, and therefore no desire, to change the current of events.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, is it not true that two days have been devoted to other matters?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am sure the Senator is correct about that, because I have had the cooperation of the Senator from Iowa. He has not filibustered. He has not improperly obstructed the consideration of this bill. He is opposed to it, and he said so; and everything that he has done has been done in a manly and proper way. I have not the slightest criticism to address to anything he has done.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 4603. An act to authorize the Jackson Highway Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tombigbee River at Princes Lower Landing, near Jackson, Ala.;

S. 4726. An act to permit issue by the supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges; and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to permit the issuance of medical and other supplies to the American National Red Cross for a temporary period.

RECESS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, May 19, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 18, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, that under the dispensation of Thy providence we are permitted to assemble once more within these historic walls where legislative enactments become a part of the body politic. Inspire these Thy servants with clear perceptions, high resolves, and patriotic endeavors, that good government may more and more obtain, and wherever the Stars and Stripes shall float on land or sea life, liberty, truth, and justice may be upheld and maintained, not only for the good of our Republic but for the good of all mankind. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER—GEORGE M. BOWERS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BOWERS, who has just been elected to fill the vacancy in the second district of West Virginia, is here, though his certificate has not yet been made out. I have consulted with Members on the other side, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. BOWERS may be sworn in as a Member notwithstanding the fact that his certificate has not yet been received.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that Mr. BOWERS, of the second district of West Virginia, a newly elected Member, shall be sworn in, notwithstanding his credentials have not yet arrived.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand that we have several precedents for this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is there any controversy over the election?

Mr. MANN. There is no contest over the certificate.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand that we have some precedents to this effect, and I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOWERS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as Representative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a resolution on the subject of woman suffrage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCRACKEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a resolution on the question of woman suffrage. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A resolution by whom?

Mr. McCRACKEN. It is from a number of citizens who held a mass meeting in my home city of Boise, Idaho, on May 9.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think we should print all the resolutions in the Record on these various questions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not object. It is a very short resolution from the gentleman's home city.

Mr. FITZGERALD. From his home town? If it is from the "home folks," I will not object. I hope this will not be a common practice, however.

Mr. McCRACKEN. I thank you. I will ask to put in only one of several similar resolutions which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House take up for consideration the bill known as the California and Oregon land-forfeiture bill (H. R. 14864). I believe every man in the House knows the urgent importance of getting this bill through. Congress must take some action under the Supreme Court decision of June 9, and we can finish it on that day, and I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, that the Oregon and California railroad forfeiture land bill be taken up.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make this inquiry: The Committee on Flood Control yesterday finished their bill, and they lost the call under Calendar Wednesday. Is it the intention of the gentleman from North Carolina, when this Oregon land bill is disposed of, that the call will go where it now is or with the committee reporting the Oregon land bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. We can take up the regular order on Calendar Wednesday where it left off.

Mr. CRISP. I thought it wise to bring that out.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand that the Judiciary Committee under the calendar has the first call.

Mr. MANN. The Ways and Means Committee is ahead of that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Ways and Means Committee has the call, and we will arrange that with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. Of course if this consent is granted and this bill that the gentleman from North Carolina is referring to does not take up all of Calendar Wednesday, we will start